DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 454 SE 024 369

TITLE	Survey II of Public and Leadership Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Development in the United States. Study No. 2628.
INSTITUTION	Harris (Louis) and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Ebasco Services Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Nov 76
NOTE	176p.; For related document, see SE 024 368; Contains occasional light and broken type
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes; Economics; Energy; *Energy Conservation; *National Surveys; Politics; Pollution; *Public Opinion; Scientists; *Surveys; *Utilities; Waste Disposal
IDENTIFIERS	*Nuclear Power

ABSTRACT

This publication details a national survey done by Louis Harris and Associates, similar to one done in 1975, to assess attitudes toward nuclear power in the United States. The survey consisted of three parts. The first part was in-person, door-to-door interviews with 1,597 randomly selected households nationwide. The second part was 309 interviews, about one hour long, with neighbors of nuclear power plants in three areas of the country. The third part was personal interviews with 214 political, business, environmental, and regulatory agency leaders in the nation. Interview questions and data, discussions of each section of the study, and a general summary are included. Some of the topics examined are the rising concern over energy shortages, sufficiency of electric power supply, utility prices, steps proposed to help solve the energy crisis, safety, and advantages and disadvantages of nuclear power plants. Also surveyed were attitudes in support or in opposition to nuclear power plants and confidence in utilities, government, environmentalists, and scientists on nuclear issues. (MR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ebasco Services, Inc

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A SECOND SURVEY OF PUBLIC AND LEADERSHIP ATTITUDES TOWARD NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

CONDUCTED FOR

EBASCO SERVICES INCORPORATED

BY

LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

November 1976

SE 024 369

Study No. 2628

SURVEY II OF PUBLIC AND LEADERSHIP ATTITUDES TOWARD NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Conducted for

EBASCO SERVICES INCORPORATED

November 1976

by

LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Organizations wishing to reprint this study are granted permission to do so. Please send a copy to Manager, Corporate Communications, Ebasco Services Incorporated, Two Rector Street, New York, New York 10006.

EBASCO SERVICES
INCORPORATED

UTILITY CONSULTANTS - ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTORS

TWO RECTOR STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10006

CABLE ADDRESS "EBASCOE"

ROGER J. SHERMAN
PRESIDENT AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

PREFACE

In 1975 Ebasco Services Incorporated commissioned the well-known public opinion polling organization of Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. to conduct an unbiased survey of attitudes in this country toward the development of nuclear power. The survey objective was to determine the opinion of the general public, the opinion of political, business and environmental leadership groups; and the attitude of people who lived as neighbors of nuclear power installations.

Results of the Harris poll appeared in a report entitled "A Survey of Public and Leadership Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Development in the United States," issued in August 1975.

The survey showed, among other things, that the public favored the building of nuclear power plants; that they believed that we have an energy shortage that will not go away soon; that they were not willing to make environmental sacrifices; and that while favoring nuclear power development, they also had concerns about some aspects of nuclear power. Except for the environmental group, the leadership group felt the same way the public does, but--most interestingly--the political leaders were not aware of the extent to which the public favors the development of nuclear power.

Earlier this year we thought it would be worthwhile to conduct a second survey regarding the attitudes of the American public and this country's leadership toward the development of

nuclear power. Both proponents and opponents of nuclear power, zero growth philosophy, energy independence, environmental protection, etc., have been vocal during the year. Accordingly, we thought it would be particularly worthwhile to find out whether any new trends had developed since the first survey was conducted in the Spring of 1975.

Results of the second Harris survey are presented in this report. As was the case with the 1975 survey, the questions asked and the interpretation and evaluation of the resultant data were under the complete and independent control of the Harris organization.

We are pleased to grant permission to reproduce this report. Although credit to Ebasco Services Incorporated would be appreciated, such credit is not a requirement.

R J Sherman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	i
METHODOLOGY	vii
SECTION I: ENERGY SHORTAGES -- TODAY AND TOMORROW	1
Rising Concerns Over Energy Shortages	2
Energy Independence Realistically Assessed	4
Sufficiency of Electric Power Supply	5
Price Sensitivity	6
The Perceived Trend of Main Source of Energy for Electric Power Supply	8
Specific Steps Proposed to Help Solve Energy Crisis	11
SECTION II: THE PROS AND CONS OF NUCLEAR POWER	43
An In-Depth Look at the Negatives	44
A Safety Bottom Line Dimension	49
The Potential Positive Attributes of Nuclear Power	51
The Comparative Advantages of Oil, Coal, and Nuclear Power	55
Satisfying the Apprehensions About Nuclear Power	57
SECTION III: PATTERNS OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR POWER.	80
Nuclear Power Development as a National Policy	81
Nuclear Power in Your Own Community	85
SECTION IV: CONFIDENCE TRENDS AND PUBLIC POLICY MATTERS AS THEY APPLY TO THE NUCLEAR POWER ISSUE	114
Trends in Overall Confidence in Key Institutions	115
Specific Credibility of Key Spokesmen on Nuclear Energy Development	116
Credibility of Local Electric Power Companies	119
The Very Serious Problem of Air and Water Pollution	121
A Matter of Private or Public Ownership	124

SUMMARY

In August 1975, Ebasco Services Incorporated released the results of a major survey conducted by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. on the attitudes of the American public and its leaders toward nuclear power development in the United States. During the following year, a number of events and efforts called public attention to the issue of nuclear power development. On the East coast, an NRC engineer at the Indian Point, N.Y. nuclear power plant resigned in protest of claimed inadequate safeguards against potential radiation leakages. A proposition which would have called a moratorium on all nuclear power plant construction in the state was defeated in the California primary vote on June 6, 1976. More recently, the public has been exposed to a widespread debate on governmental policy toward reprocessing nuclear fuels and the potential threat of the diversion of plutonium for atomic weapons. In addition, six states were preparing to place nuclear power initiatives on their November ballots, all to be defeated however in the November election.

In July 1976, fifteen months after the original interviewing was conducted, Harris interviewers questioned a comparable cross-section of the public and its leaders -- political leaders, business leaders, energy regulators and environmentalists -- to measure what shifts in public attitudes toward nuclear power, if any, had resulted from these events and discussions. The following are some of the highlights of the 1976 study:

Concern for Energy Shortage

-- One of the real worries that continues to haunt the American public is a shortage of energy -- today, five years from now, and ten years from now. In fact, apprehension is on the rise: 64% of the public feel that the energy shortage will be serious ten years from now, up from 53% who felt that way in 1975. Leaders are sorely out-of-touch with the public, however; even more so than a year ago, they badly underestimate the extent to which the public is concerned about potential energy shortages.

-- A source of continuing worry on the part of the public and leaders over energy shortages is U.S. dependence on oil from abroad. Energy independence continues to be an agreed upon goal by all except the environmentalists, who are closer to agreement now than one year ago. Yet, even more than a year ago, the public views the chances of attaining that independence as more and more remote.

-- Basically, with the notable exception of environmentalists, the public and its leaders support a whole host of measures to build energy sources, including development of solar energy, speeding up the Alaskan pipeline, increasing efforts to produce oil shale in the West, starting widespread off-shore drilling off the U.S. coastlines, and speeding up construction of nuclear plants. The public appears unwilling, however, as they did in 1975, to solve the energy shortage at the expense of the environment.

-- Despite a general concern about an energy shortage, there is less conviction on the part of the public that electric energy will be in short supply over the next decade, although political leaders, business leaders, and regulators are not so sanguine. As in 1975, two-thirds of the public remain highly price sensitive to electric power rates; inter-

estingly, nuclear power plant neighbors are less likely now than a year ago to feel that the price of electricity has risen faster than other prices.

Future Sources of Electric Power

-- As a source of electric power, the public believes the days of heavy dependence on oil or hydroelectric power are coming to an end. In their minds, the biggest single rise in the main source of energy for generating electric power will come from nuclear power. Leadership groups share the public's expectations for increased reliance on nuclear power. The biggest change since 1975 has been in the estimates of environmentalists, who are far more certain today than a year ago about the inevitability of nuclear power dependence. One reason for this expected shift to nuclear power is the widespread acknowledgement by all groups that this country now has the technical capability to build enough nuclear power plants to meet our electrical power needs. Again, this is a major shift among environmentalists, only a minority of whom felt the U.S. had sufficient technological know-how a year ago, compared with a majority who feel that way today. Regulators and political leaders as well have developed greater confidence in our technical capability in the nuclear field.

Support for Nuclear Power

-- By a 3 to 1 margin (61 to 22%), the American public favors the building of more nuclear power plants in the United States, barely changed from the 63-19% majority in favor of this in 1975. Among the college educated, the more affluent, people in cities, and young people, support for nuclear power has softened, with slippage ranging from 3 to 11 points,

although substantial majorities are still in favor of it. Support among residents of nuclear communities, and among political leaders increased over the year, while support among regulators declined. The one group still solidly opposed (by 63-32%) to a national policy of building more nuclear plants is environmentalists, although their opposition has declined by 14 points over the year. Support for nuclear power as the main source of electrical power in their own community has slipped among the public -- 4 points -- since last year. (The public supports it by 49-31% prior to a discussion of its implications and by 51-35% after such discussion.) As in 1975, there remains a gap between support as a matter of national policy and support on a local community basis. Residents of nuclear communities show a slight increase since 1975 in their backing for local nuclear power construction.

The Negatives of Nuclear Power

-- Despite a substantial 62-21% public support of a speed-up in nuclear plant construction, concerns about a number of risks connected with nuclear power have not dissipated. In fact, as the subject has been aired and debated, some concerns have grown over the past year. Both the public and leadership groups feel the major unfinished business in nuclear power development is the problem of radioactive waste disposal. Compared with 1975, a slightly larger segment of the public now labels this a major problem.

-- Other worries expressed by a majority of the public include the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere, the chances of radioactive materials deforming human life, and the chance of explosion in the case of

an accident. The perceived dangers are greater among the public at large, however, than among residents of communities with nuclear plants, or among political, business or regulatory leaders. Environmentalists remain the most concerned.

The Safety Factor

-- Despite these major concerns, the public nonetheless considers nuclear power generation more safe than unsafe. Their 63-23% favorable rating on the safety dimension represents a slight slippage from a 64-18% favorable rating in 1975. Residents of communities with power plants give a 76-16% positive safety rating to nuclear installations. High marks on safety have gone up in the South, but have declined marginally in the other three major regions of the country. Among the pivotal college graduate group, confidence in the safety of nuclear plants has slipped 8 points in the past year. Significantly, environmentalists say that nuclear power plants are safe by a 53-45% edge.

Advantages of Nuclear Power

-- At a time of rapidly escalating energy costs, the potential appeal of relatively less expensive energy from nuclear sources is much on the minds of the American public. On the problem of potential supply, nuclear power has another powerful appeal: as a resource that can be made renewable, nuclear power appears to be a welcome alternative to oil and gas. Public perceptions of these advantages have remained consistently high over the past year. Nuclear energy is also viewed as having an impact on economic growth and development, with a perceived positive effect on jobs, new industry and whole new communities.

Nuclear Power vs. Coal or Oil

-- On a relative basis, the American public views nuclear power as a much more viable and acceptable alternative than either coal or oil. Compared with fossil fuels, nuclear power is credited with being particularly strong in solving the ultimate domestic supply source problem and eliminating U.S. dependence on foreign sources. It is also viewed as being capable of being produced in unlimited quantities in the future. In addition, nuclear power wins hands down on the air and water pollution control problems and is, unlike coal or oil, seen as a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is today. The one area in which nuclear power does not win is that of "raising few health hazards and dangers in using it," judged by 34% to have that attribute, compared with 40% for coal and 46% for oil.

Risks Worth Taking

-- The public and most of the leadership groups surveyed would feel much more secure about extending construction of nuclear plants if tight regulations and inspections were made by government to insure that major safety hazards have been taken into account and that the probability of such problems will be minimized. While at least two in three Americans feel that with proper safeguards this is a risk worth taking, willingness to take such risks has nonetheless fallen off since 1975. Seventy-two percent of the public (vs. 79% in 1975) feel that allowing nuclear power plants to be built is worth the risk, for example, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste development. Throughout, environmentalists do not consent to the risks involved in nuclear power plant construction, even though a majority of them agree that, on balance, nuclear power is safe.

Spokesmen on Nuclear Power

-- Any kind of federal, state or local government stand in opposition to nuclear power development in the community would lead sizeable majorities of the public to oppose such construction. The sanction of government authority, coupled with the location of the plant itself in less populous areas, would increase public acceptance. Public confidence in the scientists as the key spokesmen on nuclear power development remains high; in the public's mind, they continue to have the authoritive word on the nuclear power question.

METHODOLOGY

Between July 8th and 18th, 1976, Harris interviewers conducted in-person interviews in a representative cross-section of 1,497 households nationwide. Scientific random sampling techniques guaranteed to each household in the country an equal chance of being drawn into the sample. The public sample is therefore projectable to the entire continental United States population 18 years of age and over.

In addition, 309 interviews were conducted with neighbors of three nuclear power plants: 111 in San Onofre, California; 88 in Morris, Illinois; and 110 in Indian Point, New York. As with the public sample, the neighbors of nuclear power plants were selected by random probability techniques and represent a cross-section of residents of these areas. As in 1975, the special sample of neighbors of nuclear plants was included

to determine the extent to which people who live near site locations are different from the public at large in their attitudes toward nuclear power.

Finally, specially trained Harris executive interviewers conducted in-person interviews with a total of 214 leaders nationwide: 53 political leaders (elected and appointed federal, state and local officials), 58 business leaders (vice presidents of public affairs in large and medium-sized companies), 47 regulators (officials of federal and state regulatory agencies such as the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, state regulatory commissions) and 56 environmental leaders (Sierra Club, other leading environmental groups). The leadership are generally a more knowledgeable and articulate group than the public at large and are more likely to become involved in the detailed discussion and resolution of the problems involved in nuclear energy development.

The study was commissioned by Ebasco Services Incorporated. The design of the study and the analysis of the results were entirely the responsibility of Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

SECTION I:

ENERGY SHORTAGES -- TODAY AND TOMORROW

Rising Concerns Over Energy Shortages

Despite a general lack of urgency or emphasis by the country's political leadership and the media about energy over the past year, fully 80% of the American people feel that the energy shortage "today" is "serious", with 40% saying it is "very serious". This marks little change in public worry over energy from that recorded in the previous survey in April of 1975, when 78% of the people felt the same way.

Table 1

Table 2

Looking to the near-term and intermediate future, however, the public is more pessimistic in its energy outlook then it was a year ago. Fully 73% of the people feel the shortage will be "serious" five years from now, up from 66% who felt that way in 1975. Ten years from now, in the view of 64% of the public, the energy shortage will be "serious", up from 53% who felt that way in 1975.

If energy apprehensions appear to be rising among the public, then the leadership group surveyed -- political leaders, business leaders, regulators and environmentalists -- exhibit almost a total lack of perception of public worries. When asked to estimate how the public now views the energy shortage, no more than 2% of political leaders, 9% of business leaders, 9% of regulators and 5% of environmentalists think people feel the energy shortage is "very serious". In fact, leaders have moved toward an even lower estimate of public worry over energy than in 1975.

Table 3

There is irony in this gross underestimation of the leadership's estimate of the public on how serious the energy situation is viewed. For, when asked their own views about the shortage, 94% of the political leaders, 98% of the business leaders, 95% of the regulators, and 92% of the environmentalists acknowledge that they see the shortage as "serious". Environ-

mentalists tend to feel slightly less strongly about it, with 48% saying it is "very serious" and 44% as "only somewhat serious". With the exception of environmentalists, who show less concern for the energy shortage today than they did one year ago (56% viewed it as "very serious" then), leadership groups have not altered their evaluation of the seriousness of the energy shortage over the past year.

In a five-year time frame, over 9 in 10 of all of the leadership groups view the potential for an energy shortage as "serious", with majorities of all leaders estimating it as "very serious." Ten years out produces little change in the optimism of the leadership groups surveyed, with a majority classifying the energy shortage then as "very serious". Close to 9 in 10 of all groups think it will be "serious".

Observation:

There is little question that one of the real clouds of doubt that have become inbuilt into the roster of worries the American people and their leaders carry with them these days is that little has been solved in the way of providing for this country's energy needs and that shortages are imminent today, five years from now, and ten years down the road. While between 4 and 5 out of every 10 people in the country classify the shortages as "very serious", apprehension clearly is on the rise, showing no sign of abating, despite the lack of attention paid the subject recently.

Almost uniformly, leadership out of the public or private sector tends to badly underestimate the extent to which the public is concerned with potential energy shortages, both in the near-term and longer-term future. Nuclear plant neighbors tend to parallel the public's view of the shortages. It is evident that, throughout all segments of the American public today, there is a distinct sense of unease that this country is not secure in its energy supply and faces periods of insufficiency ahead.

Energy Independence Realistically Assessed

Table 4

As in 1975, by 81-15% the vast majority of Americans would like to see the U.S. become totally independent of all foreign sources of energy. Political leaders feel the same way by 64-36%, business leaders by 78-22%, regulators by 68-30%, although environmentalists disagree by a narrow 49-46%.

Table 5

However, last year a much higher 67-33% majority of environmentalists were opposed to the U.S. striving for energy self-sufficiency.

Despite this near unanimity about the desirability of energy

Table 6

independence, by 51-41% the public is convinced that the U.S. will not be free from all foreign sources of energy for at least the next 20 years.

Table 7

This latest result marks a distinct shift from the narrow 46-45% plurality who were dour about the prospects of achieving energy independence back in 1975.

The trend among the leadership groups surveyed is even more doubtful that energy independence can be reached: political leaders doubt it by 87-13%, business leaders by 84-16%, regulators by 91-9%, and environmentalists by 82-16%. Business leaders and regulators are even more pessimistic now than they were a year ago about the possibility of achieving energy independence, while political leaders are now slightly more optimistic than they were then.

The main reason for this abiding sense that the chances of achieving self-sufficiency in energy are slim can be found in the awareness that this country is now more dependent on oil imported from abroad than it was

Table 9

a few years ago. A plurality of 48-43% among the public generally, a

majority of nuclear power plant community residents (54-37%), a majority of political leaders (94-6%), a majority of business leaders (76-24%), a majority of regulators (87-13%), and a majority of environmentalists (83-15%) all are correct in estimating that the amount of dependence on foreign oil in the U.S. has been rising.

Observation:

Certainly one of the reasons for the continuing worry on the part of the public as well as the leadership that the imminence of energy shortages has not passed can be traced to real unease people have about U.S. dependence on oil from abroad to meet our ongoing needs. Although energy independence is an agreed upon national goal, realistically the chances of attaining that status appears more and more remote in this country today.

Sufficiency of Electric Power Supply

Specifically, in the electric power area, the public is more sanguine about supply. By 60-32%, a majority of the American people do not feel that there is a shortage of electric power today. The West tends to be more dubious, expressing confidence in electric power supply by a narrower 49-42%. Political leaders see no shortage by a closer 55-42%, a view shared by regulators by 59-39%, and by business leaders by 53-45%. Environmentalists are much more convinced than any other group that there is no shortage of electric power, by a thumping 77-21%.

Table 10

Table 11

Ten years from now, the public still feels by 50-33% that there will not be a shortage of electric power, a point of view also shared by nuclear plant neighbors and environmentalists. However, by 58-34% political leaders feel there will be such a shortage, and this opinion is shared by business leaders by 54-36%, and by regulators by 53-38%. Again,

Table 12

however, roughly 1 in every 7 leaders think the public feels there will be an electrical energy shortage in the long-run in this country, far under what the public actually thinks.

Table 14

At the same time, 41% of the public report using more electricity now than five years ago, while 39% say they are using the same amount and 17% say less. Thus, the thrust is to use more electricity rather than less.

Observation:

There is less conviction on the part of the public that electric energy will be short in supply over the next decade. Political and business leaders, and regulatory leaders are more convinced there will be such shortages. However, the public readily admits to using more electric power itself, but obviously has not made the connection between its own rate of usage and the overall energy shortages felt to be imminent into the near and medium-term future.

Price Sensitivity

Table 16

At the top of the list of items which have gone up faster than other prices is medical services and drugs, cited by 8 in 10 of the public, nuclear community people, political leaders, business leaders, regulators,

and environmentalists as having risen faster than other things. Close behind is the price of gasoline, which 79% of the public, two-thirds of political leaders, and 80% of environmentalists feel has risen faster than the consumer price index.

In third place comes electric power, seen to have risen faster than other items by 65% of the public, 57% of the nuclear plant neighbors, 62% of political leaders, 48% of the business leaders, 48% of the regulators, and 63% of the environmentalists. No more than 6% of the public feel electric power prices have gone up less rapidly than other items and 26% believe they have gone up at about the same rate.

Table 18

Interestingly, neighbors of nuclear plants are less likely this year to feel that the price of electric power has risen faster than most prices than they were a year ago: in 1975, 65% of this group felt that way, compared with only 57% in 1976.

In fourth place is meat, on which a majority of 53% of the public feel such prices have gone up faster than other items, a view shared by nuclear community neighbors, but not by the leadership group, which has the impression that meat prices have by and large levelled out -- in line with the consumer price index.

Observation:

Two-thirds of the American people are highly price sensitive to electric power rates and prices, feeling they have risen more than most other items in their shopping basket over the past few years. Given a relative lack of urgency about electric power shortages now or into the future, this means that the American people are apt to be somewhat unimpressed by requests by electric power companies for rate increases based on shortages of supply of energy sources.

The Perceived Trend of Main Source of Energy for Electric Power Supply

Table 19

According to the U.S. public, the main source of their electric power supply today is oil (28%), hydroelectric power (21%), and coal (19%). No more than 3% report their electric power system is utilizing nuclear power, and 1% solar energy.

However, the public believes that the days of heavy dependence on oil or hydroelectric power are foreseeably coming to an end. Ten years from now, the people see their local systems mainly depending on oil only to the tune of 6%,and in 25 years no more than 2% still think oil will be dominant. Much the same pattern of decline can be seen for hydroelectric power: down to 7% in 10 years, and almost disappearing to 2% in 25 years.

The picture on coal is estimated to be a more gradual decline in dependence: down from 19% to 15% in the next 10 years, and then down to 5% in 25 years.

The biggest single rise in main source of energy for generating electric power, according to the public, will come from nuclear power. Compared with the 3% who view nuclear power as a major source of energy now, in 10 years 35% believe nuclear will dominate. Twenty-five years out, 32% still see nuclear power as the chief source of electric power.

Long term, solar energy is viewed as holding out real hope of becoming a major source of electric power. Compared with the 1% who now say they depend on solar energy mainly, in 10 years this rises to 9%, and 25 years out it shoots up to 25%, almost as high as nuclear power as a source of electric power.

Table 20

The pattern of expectations among the leadership groups surveyed is comparable to that among the public. Over the next 10 years, a substantial rise is seen by political, business, and regulatory leaders, as well as environmentalists, in primary dependence on nuclear energy for

Table 21

electric power. Over a 25-year period, even higher percentages of all of these groups foresee nuclear power as the primary source of electric power

Table 22

in this country. The biggest change since 1975 has been in the estimates of environmentalists, who back then were far less certain than they are today about the inevitability of nuclear power dependence.

One reason for this rather decisive shift to expect nuclear power dependence in the electric power field is the widespread acknowledgement

Table 23

by all groups that this country now has the technical capability to build enough nuclear plants to meet our electric power needs. By 69-21%, the

public feels we do have sufficient technical know-how in the nuclear area, a view shared by a 77-15% majority of nuclear community residents, 75-25% of the political leaders, 84-16% among business leaders, 79-15% among regulators, and 65-35% among environmentalists. The opinions of environmentalists have changed dramatically on this point: in 1975, only 39% of this group felt we had sufficient technical know-how in the nuclear area, compared with 65% who feel this way in 1976. Regulators and political leaders as well have developed greater confidence during the last year in our technical know-how in the nuclear area.

Table 24

When asked how soon it will be possible to build nuclear plants to meet a major part of our electric power needs, the median number of years estimated by the public is 13 years. Nuclear plant community residents are a slightly higher 14%. The leadership group believes it will take slightly longer, ranging from the median 18 years given by business leaders and regulators to the 20 years estimated by political leaders and 22 years by environmentalists.

Table 25

In the case of solar energy, the public is much more optimistic than the leaders. The people are split down the middle, 43-43%, on whether or not we have the technical know-how now to build enough solar plants to meet our electric power needs. This is approximately what it was in 1975. Nuclear power plant neighbors have become slightly more skeptical, with a 51-40% majority doubting we now have the capability to construct solar energy plants. Among the leaders, by 96-2% political leaders doubt we have the know-how, a view shared by a 95-5% majority of business leaders, an 89-11% majority among regulators, and a 68-32% majority among environmentalists.

Table 26

Table 27

When asked how long it would take to bring in enough solar energy to generate a major part of our electric power needs, the median estimate of the public is 17 years, among nuclear community residents 20 years, and over 25 years with all of the leadership groups.

Table 28

Observation:

It is apparent that most Americans are convinced we now have the basic technical know-how to build nuclear plants to meet the mainstream energy needs for electric power generation. Sizable majorities of both the public and leaders believe that. However, it is generally estimated that it will take between 13 and 20 years to bring nuclear capabilities to a level where they are a major source.

However, the one alternative seriously considered to nuclear energy -- the construction of solar energy plants -- is thought by the leadership and about half the public not to be technically feasible now. Most think it will take from 17 years to over 25 years to realize the potential of solar energy.

As attractive as solar energy might be to many, it simply is not viewed as a practical alternative in today's state of know-how. Nuclear, by contrast, is considered a practical alternative, if, as will be seen, the major caveats about nuclear power can be met. This does not mean that the public is averse to pursuing solar energy. It does mean that most people are convinced that, if the nation's energy needs are to be met, nuclear power must figure large in the solution of that supply problem.

Specific Steps Proposed to Help Solve Energy Crisis

As was evident in the 1975 survey, majorities or pluralities of the public favor a wide variety of steps to alleviate the energy crunch:

Table 29

--By 82-4%, a lop-sided majority support steps to "speed up the development of solar energy for power."

--By 77-12%, a sizable majority support speeding up "construction of the Alaskan oil pipeline."

--By 65-17%, a clear majority favor "increasing efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states."

--By 64-22%, a big majority also support starting "off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts."

--By 62-21%, a sizable majority favor "speeding up the building of new nuclear power plants."

--By 49-36%, a clear plurality support "allowing more strip mining of coal."

--By a narrow 38-35%, a plurality support "eliminating electric power plants that use oil by 1980."

Two steps, however, meet with rejection from the public:

--A sizable 71-20% majority oppose a "slow down in the clean-up of air and water pollution" as a way to help solve the energy crisis.

--A 48-34% plurality oppose the "use of U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption."

Although sizable majorities in most cases favor most of these proposed steps to help solve the energy crisis, a number have dropped slightly in support since 1975: the Alaska pipeline, down from 81-10% to 77-12%; nuclear power plants, down from 67-18% to 62-21%; and eliminating power plants using oil, down from 42-31% to 38-35%. Comparably, opposition to slowing down a clean up of the environment to relieve the energy crisis has risen from 65-26% to 71-20%.

Table 30

Table 31

At the leadership level, sizable majorities concur with the public on development of solar energy. Majorities of all the groups, except environmentalists, agree on speeding up construction of the Alaskan pipe-

line. The environmentalists are opposed by a slim 42-38%. Majorities of the leaders in all groups, except the environmentalists, also give their sanction to increasing efforts to produce oil shale in the West. Environmentalists oppose shale production by 63-34%. Majorities of the leaders also approve starting off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts. However, a plurality of environmentalists approve off-shore drilling by 47-42%, less than other leader groups.

In the case of speeding up the building of new nuclear power plants, a larger 68-22% majority of neighbors in nuclear communities support such a move, as do a 62-34% majority of political leaders, a thumping 91-9% of business leaders, and a 68-30% majority of regulators. Environmentalists, however, oppose nuclear plant construction by 71-25%. The 25% minority in favor of nuclear plant construction is twice the size of the group of environmentalist supporters (13%) one year ago.

Majorities among political and business leaders and regulators go on record in favor of pushing more strip mining of coal, although environmentalists stand opposed by 56-36%. Eliminating electric power plants which use oil by 1980 meets with opposition among all leadership groups, as does efforts to slow down air and water pollution clean-ups to achieve more energy. However, on use of U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption, a 57-34% majority of political leaders favor such a move, although either pluralities or majorities of the other groups are opposed to tapping the Naval reserve supplies.

Observation:

Basically, with the notable exception of the environmentalists, the public and its leaders render a broad mandate for a whole host of specific measures which they feel will build energy sources, mainly here in the United States. These include development of solar energy, speeding up the Alaskan pipeline, upping efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states, starting widespread off-shore drilling off the U.S. coastlines, speeding up construction of nuclear plants, and allowing strip mining of coal.

Given the public's recognition of the energy shortage and the likelihood that the shortage will intensify with time, it is apparent that the American people and most of their leaders opt for getting on with the development of newer sources of energy for use in electric power generation closer to home. Although opposition has mounted slightly since 1975, sizable majorities favor most of the major steps which have been proposed to ease the energy shortage. The public appears unwilling, however, to abandon pollution clean-up efforts in order to solve the energy shortage.

Q.1a,b,c

Table 1
SERIOUSNESS OF ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Today					
Very serious	40	77	77	74	48
Only somewhat serious	40	17	21	21	44
Hardly serious at all	17	6	2	2	6
Not sure	3	-	-	3	2
Five Years From Now					
Very serious	47	87	82	81	65
Only somewhat serious	26	13	16	15	26
Hardly serious at all	16	-	2	2	4
Not sure	11	-	-	2	5
Ten Years From Now					
Very serious	44	66	60	74	59
Only somewhat serious	20	28	33	19	24
Hardly serious at all	19	2	7	2	6
Not sure	17	4	-	5	11

Q.1a,b,c

Table 2
SERIOUSNESS OF THE ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Today												
Very serious	40	38	48	37	77	78	77	76	74	72	48	56
Only somewhat serious	40	40	35	44	17	20	21	20	21	21	44	31
Hardly serious at all	17	18	15	15	6	2	2	4	2	4	6	13
Not sure	3	4	2	4	-	-	-	-	3	3	2	-
Five Years From Now												
Very serious	47	40	51	45	87	82	82	71	81	62	65	56
Only somewhat serious	26	26	23	24	13	14	16	25	15	30	26	33
Hardly serious at all	16	19	14	17	-	-	2	4	2	4	4	6
Not sure	11	15	12	14	-	4	-	-	2	4	5	5
Ten Years From Now												
Very serious	44	33	43	38	66	51	60	39	74	51	59	41
Only somewhat serious	20	20	20	18	28	31	33	49	19	34	24	35
Hardly serious at all	19	26	20	20	2	10	7	10	2	11	6	14
Not sure	17	21	17	24	4	8	-	2	5	4	11	10

Q.1a,b,c
(L-Q.15a,b,c)

Table 3
SERIOUSNESS OF ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THIS COUNTRY
("Very serious" only)

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by: Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
1976	%	%	%	%	%
Today	40	2	9	9	5
Five years from now	47	12	16	30	11
Ten years from now	44	25	31	47	21
1975					
Today	38	10	12	15	29
Five years from now	40	12	18	28	27
Ten years from now	33	8	20	21	25

Q.5a

Table 4
WHETHER WOULD LIKE TO SEE U.S. BECOME
TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY

	Would Like to See %	Would Not Like to See %	Not Sure %
Total Public	81	15	4
18-29 years	76	21	3
30-49 years	81	14	5
50 years and over	83	12	5
Total Nucplant Neighbors	83	14	3
Political Leaders	64	36	-
Business Leaders	78	22	-
Regulators	68	30	2
Environmentalists	46	49	5

Table 5
WHETHER WOULD LIKE TO SEE U.S. BECOME
TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Would like to see	81	80	83	85	64	39	78	69	68	74	46	33
Would not like to see	15	16	14	12	36	61	22	31	30	26	49	67
Not sure	4	4	3	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	5	-

Q.5b

Table 6
REALISTICALLY, HOW GOOD ARE THE CHANCES THAT THE U.S. CAN BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY IN NEXT 20 YEARS

	Certain To Happen %	Likely To Happen %	Not Likely To Happen %	Almost Certain It Won't Happen %	Not Sure %
Total Public	12	29	37	14	8
18-29 years	8	28	43	16	5
30-49 years	11	29	38	14	8
50 years and over	15	29	34	12	10
Would like to see U.S. totally independent	14	31	36	12	7
Would not like to see U.S. totally independent	4	18	48	25	5
Total Nucplant Neighbors	13	34	35	11	7
Political Leaders	2	11	47	40	-
Business Leaders	2	14	46	38	-
Regulators	-	9	48	43	-
Environmentalists	2	14	38	44	2

Q.5b

Table 7
REALISTICALLY, HOW GOOD ARE THE CHANCES THAT THE U.S. CAN BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY IN NEXT 20 YEARS

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Certain to happen	12	12	13	15	2	-	2	2	-	6	2	2
Likely to happen	29	33	34	37	11	12	14	20	9	19	14	12
Not likely to happen	37	33	35	32	47	39	46	53	48	36	38	38
Almost certain it won't happen	14	13	11	10	40	49	38	25	43	39	44	48
Not sure	8	9	7	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-

Q.5b

Table 8
REALISTICALLY, HOW GOOD ARE THE CHANCES THAT THE U.S. CAN BE TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY IN NEXT 20 YEARS

	Total Public		Would Like To See U.S. Totally Independent		Would Not Like To See U.S. Totally Independent	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Certain to happen	12	12	14	13	4	4
Likely to happen	29	33	31	36	18	19
Not likely to happen	37	33	36	32	48	41
Almost certain it won't happen	14	13	12	10	25	29
Not sure	8	9	7	9	5	7

Q.1d

Table 9
DEPENDENCE ON OIL IMPORTED FROM ABROAD TODAY,
COMPARED TO A FEW YEARS AGO

	More Dependent %	Less Dependent %	About As Dependent %	Not Sure %
Total Public	48	12	31	9
East	42	13	36	9
Midwest	51	11	31	7
South	47	10	28	15
West	57	11	25	7
Some High School or less	39	12	31	18
High School grad./some college	51	12	31	6
College graduate	56	10	29	5
Total Nucplant Neighbors	54	8	29	9
Political Leaders	94	2	4	-
Business Leaders	76	3	21	-
Regulators	87	4	9	-
Environmentalists	83	-	15	2

Q.2a

Table 10
WHETHER THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER TODAY

	Shortage %	No Shortage %	Not Sure %
Total Public	32	60	8
East	32	61	7
Midwest	31	62	7
South	23	66	11
West	42	49	9
Total Nucplant Neighbors	36	58	6
Political Leaders	42	55	3
Business Leaders	45	53	2
Regulators	39	59	2
Environmentalists	21	77	2

Q.2b

Table 11
WHETHER THERE WILL BE A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER
IN THIS COUNTRY TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	Shortage %	No Shortage %	Not Sure %
Total Public	33	50	17
Total Nucplant Neighbors	36	51	13
Political Leaders	58	34	8
Business Leaders	54	36	10
Regulators	53	38	9
Environmentalists	38	57	5

Q.2b,15d
(L-Q.15d)

Table 12
WHETHER THERE WILL BE A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER
IN THIS COUNTRY TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by: Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Shortage	33	15	14	13	11
No shortage	50	81	84	85	80
Not sure	17	4	2	2	9

Q.2a,b

Table 13
SHORTAGES OF ENERGY TODAY VS. TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Oil						
Shortage today	39	39	53	38	51	25
Shortage ten years from now	53	51	79	70	81	62
Net change	+14	+12	+26	+32	+30	+37
Solar Energy						
Shortage today	37	44	81	59	76	65
Shortage ten years from now	19	16	64	48	67	46
Net change	-18	-28	-17	-11	- 9	-19
Nuclear Power						
Shortage today	32	31	62	51	55	19
Shortage ten years from now	17	17	38	44	47	25
Net change	-15	-14	-24	- 7	- 8	+ 6
Electric Power						
Shortage today	32	36	42	45	39	21
Shortage ten years from now	33	36	58	54	53	38
Net change	+ 1	-	+16	+ 9	+14	+17
Coal						
Shortage today	16	15	2	12	11	6
Shortage ten years from now	27	29	11	13	11	8
Net change	+11	+14	+ 9	+ 1	-	+ 2

Q.3b

Table 14
USE OF ELECTRICITY TODAY, COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Using a lot more	17	22	8	12	21	9
Using some, but not a lot more	24	21	19	39	23	16
Using about the same amount	39	33	44	33	31	33
Using some, but not a lot less	12	15	25	7	21	33
Using a lot less	5	7	4	9	4	9
Not sure	3	2	-	-	-	-
Using more	41	43	27	51	44	25
Using same	39	33	44	33	31	33
Using less	17	22	29	16	25	42

Q.3b

Table 15
USE OF ELECTRICITY TODAY, COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO

	Total Public	
	August 1976 %	April 1975 %
Using a lot more	17	16
Using some, but not a lot more	24	25
Using about the same amount	39	36
Using some, but not a lot less	12	13
Using a lot less	5	7
Not sure	3	3
Using more	41	41
Using same	39	36
Using less	17	20

Q.3d

Table 16

RISE IN PRICES OF SPECIFIC ITEMS, COMPARED TO MOST OTHER THINGS YOU BUY

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
Medical Services and Drugs	%	%	%	%	%	%
Gone up more						
Gone up more	81	81	92	78	78	79
Gone up less	2	2	2	-	-	-
Gone up about as much	13	13	6	21	15	16
Not sure	4	4	-	1	7	5
Gasoline						
Gone up more	79	79	64	69	68	80
Gone up less	2	4	6	9	11	4
Gone up about as much	16	14	30	21	21	14
Not sure	3	3	-	1	-	2
Electric Power						
Gone up more	65	57	62	48	48	63
Gone up less	6	8	13	24	11	4
Gone up about as much	26	31	25	26	39	32
Not sure	3	4	-	2	2	1
Meat						
Gone up more	53	53	17	21	21	36
Gone up less	6	7	19	12	19	7
Gone up about as much	39	38	58	53	57	43
Not sure	2	2	6	14	3	14

Q.3d

Table 17

RISE IN PRICE OF ELECTRIC POWER, COMPARED TO MOST OTHER THINGS YOU BUY

	Gone Up More Than Most Other Things You Buy	Gone Up Less	Gone Up About As Much As Other Things	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%
Total Public	**65**	**6**	**26**	**3**
East	77	3	15	5
Midwest	59	7	32	2
South	67	4	27	2
West	51	9	36	4
Cities	63	6	27	4
Suburbs	71	5	22	2
Towns	67	8	22	3
Rural	60	5	33	2
Under $5,000	69	5	21	5
$5,000-$9,999	67	4	26	3
$10,000-$14,999	65	6	26	3
$15,000 and over	63	6	29	2
Total Nucplant Neighbors	**57**	**8**	**31**	**4**
Indian Point, N.Y.	85	2	12	1
Morris, Ill.	48	10	42	-
San Onofre, Calif.	37	14	41	8

Q.3d

Table 18

RISE IN PRICE OF ELECTRIC POWER, COMPARED TO MOST OTHER THINGS YOU BUY

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors	
	August 1976 %	April 1975 %	August 1976 %	April 1975 %
Gone up more	65	65	57	65
Gone up less	6	7	8	6
Gone up about as much	26	25	31	26
Not sure	3	3	4	3

Q.3e,f,g

Table 19
LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
TO PRODUCE ELECTRIC POWER

	Public				
	Today	10 Years From Now	25 Years From Now	Net Change In 10 Years	Net Change In 25 Years
	%	%	%	%	%
Oil	28	6	2	-22	-26
Hydroelectric power	21	7	2	-14	-19
Coal	19	15	5	- 4	-14
Nuclear power	3	35	32	+32	+29
Solar energy	1	9	25	+ 8	+24
Other	2	1	1	- 1	- 1
Not sure	26	27	33	+ 1	+ 7

	Nucplant Neighbors				
	Today	10 Years From Now	25 Years From Now	Net Change In 10 Years	Net Change In 25 Years
	%	%	%	%	%
Oil	34	9	4	-25	-30
Nuclear power	25	58	43	+33	+18
Hydroelectric power	13	2	1	-11	-12
Coal	11	5	2	- 6	- 9
Solar energy	-	11	33	+11	+33
Other	-	*	1	+ *	+ 1
Not sure	17	15	16	- 2	- 1

Q.3e,f

Table 20

NET CHANGE PREDICTED IN LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY TO PRODUCE ELECTRIC POWER OVER NEXT TEN YEARS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Nuclear power	+32	+33	+20	+33	+32	+34
Solar energy	+ 8	+11	-	+ 2	+ 2	+ 2
Coal	- 4	- 6	- 1	+10	+ 2	+10
Hydro-electric power	-14	-11	-10	- 4	-12	-
Oil	-22	-25	-13	-21	-27	-35
Other	- 1	+ *	- 6	- 7	- 4	+ 2
Not sure	+ 1	- 2	-	- 6	-	- 3

Q.3e,g

Table 21
NET CHANGE PREDICTED IN LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
TO PRODUCE ELECTRIC POWER OVER NEXT TWENTY-FIVE YEARS

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nuclear power	+29	+18	+45	+55	+56	+41
Solar energy	+24	+33	+ 9	+14	+13	+21
Coal	-14	- 9	-18	-13	-12	- 7
Hydro-electric power	-19	-12	-11	- 9	-19	-
Oil	-26	-30	-30	-33	-36	-52
Other	- 1	+ 1	- 2	- 5	- 4	-
Not sure	+ 7	- 1	+ 2	- 6	+ 2	+ 2

Q.3e,f

Table 22
NET CHANGE PREDICTED IN LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S USING NUCLEAR POWER TO PRODUCE ELECTRICITY OVER NEXT TEN YEARS

	August 1976 %	April 1975 %
Total Public	+32	+26
Total Nucplant Neighbors	+33	+30
Political Leaders	+20	+33
Business Leaders	+33	+39
Regulators	+32	+26
Environmentalists	+34	+ 4

Q.7g

Table 23
WHETHER U.S. NOW HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH NUCLEAR PLANTS TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Has Technical Know-how Now %	Technology Not Yet Developed %	Not Sure %
Total Public	69	21	10
Total Nucplant Neighbors	77	15	8
Political Leaders	75	25	-
Business Leaders	84	16	-
Regulators	79	15	6
Environmentalists	65	35	-

Q.7g

Table 24
WHETHER U.S. NOW HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH NUCLEAR PLANTS TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
U.S. has technical know-how now	69	68	77	75	75	67	84	86	79	68	65	39
Technology not yet developed	21	20	15	17	25	29	16	10	15	30	35	57
Not sure	10	12	8	8	-	4	-	4	6	2	-	4

Q.7h

Table 25
HOW LONG IT WOULD TAKE FOR U.S. TO BUILD ENOUGH NUCLEAR PLANTS TO MEET A MAJOR PART OF OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Under 5 Years %	5-9 Years %	10-14 Years %	15-25 Years %	Over 25 Years %	Not Sure %	Median Number Of Years #
Total Public	5	15	26	20	9	25	13
Total Nucplant Neighbors	6	15	28	28	10	13	14
Political Leaders	-	2	21	41	30	6	20
Business Leaders	-	4	29	40	23	4	18
Regulators	-	4	26	47	19	4	18
Environmentalists	-	8	11	35	35	11	22

Q.7i

Table 26
WHETHER U.S. NOW HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH SOLAR ENERGY PLANTS TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Has Technical Know-how Now %	Technology Not Yet Developed %	Not Sure %
Total Public	43	43	14
Total Nucplant Neighbors	40	51	9
Political Leaders	2	96	2
Business Leaders	5	95	-
Regulators	11	89	-
Environmentalists	32	68	-

Q.71

Table 27
WHETHER U.S. HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH SOLAR ENERGY PLANTS TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
U.S. has technical know-how now	43	39	40	40	2	10	5	8	11	11	32	17
Technology not yet developed	43	41	51	41	96	86	95	88	89	87	68	81
Not sure	14	20	9	19	2	4	-	4	-	2	-	2

Q.7j

Table 28

HOW LONG IT WOULD TAKE FOR U.S. TO BUILD ENOUGH SOLAR ENERGY PLANTS TO MEET A MAJOR PART OF OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Under 5 Years %	5-9 Years %	10-14 Years %	15-25 Years %	Over 25 Years %	Not Sure %	Median Number Of Years #
Total Public	3	10	18	22	19	28	17
Total Nucplant Neighbors	3	7	16	29	28	17	20
Political Leaders	-	2	8	28	60	2	Over 25
Business Leaders	-	2	7	16	71	4	Over 25
Regulators	-	2	9	13	69	7	Over 25
Environmentalists	2	4	15	27	50	2	Over 25

Q.4

Table 29
FAVOR/OPPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	Total Public %	East %	Mid-west %	South %	West %	Some High School Or Less %	High School Graduate/ Some College %	College Graduate %
Speed up the development of solar energy for power								
Favor	82	87	84	70	88	65	88	93
Oppose	4	3	6	5	4	7	3	3
Not sure	14	10	10	25	8	28	9	4
Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline								
Favor	77	81	76	82	67	77	81	67
Oppose	12	9	17	7	20	8	11	24
Not sure	11	10	7	11	13	15	8	9
Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states								
Favor	65	68	67	65	56	64	68	59
Oppose	17	13	17	12	29	10	17	28
Not sure	18	19	16	23	15	26	15	13
Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts								
Favor	64	65	64	68	56	67	66	56
Oppose	22	19	24	12	35	11	23	34
Not sure	14	16	12	20	9	22	11	10
Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants								
Favor	62	60	63	62	62	60	64	59
Oppose	21	24	20	15	27	14	21	30
Not sure	17	16	17	23	11	26	15	11
Allow more strip mining of coal								
Favor	49	50	53	51	40	52	52	38
Oppose	36	37	34	30	47	26	35	55
Not sure	15	13	13	19	13	22	13	7
Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980								
Favor	38	43	38	34	35	33	41	39
Oppose	35	30	38	31	45	26	37	44
Not sure	27	27	24	35	20	41	22	17
Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption								
Favor	34	39	27	31	39	31	36	33
Oppose	48	41	57	44	50	40	50	53
Not sure	18	20	16	25	11	29	14	14
Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution								
Favor	20	25	20	20	14	21	22	12
Oppose	71	67	76	64	78	63	71	83
Not sure	9	8	4	16	8	16	7	5

Q.4

Table 30
FAVOR/OPPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Speed up the development of solar energy for power												
Favor	82	XX	90	XX	100	XX	84	XX	96	XX	93	XX
Oppose	4	XX	4	XX	-	XX	16	XX	2	XX	5	XX
Not sure	14	XX	6	XX	-	XX	-	XX	2	XX	2	XX
Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline												
Favor	77	81	80	87	90	76	84	94	77	87	38	44
Oppose	12	10	11	8	10	20	9	4	23	11	42	46
Not sure	11	9	9	5	-	4	7	2	-	2	20	10
Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states												
Favor	65	67	62	70	72	59	76	80	72	70	34	21
Oppose	17	16	19	13	25	37	21	20	28	26	63	69
Not sure	18	17	19	17	3	4	3	-	-	4	3	10
Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts												
Favor	64	66	59	59	87	75	90	90	85	70	47	44
Oppose	22	19	29	28	9	20	5	6	15	23	42	44
Not sure	14	15	12	13	4	5	5	4	-	7	11	12
Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants												
Favor	62	67	68	60	62	51	91	90	68	72	25	13
Oppose	21	18	22	25	34	47	9	8	30	26	71	79
Not sure	17	15	10	15	4	2	-	2	2	2	4	8
Allow more strip mining of coal												
Favor	49	49	50	47	68	70	84	78	72	62	36	31
Oppose	36	35	37	36	30	28	16	22	26	32	56	65
Not sure	15	16	13	17	2	2	-	-	2	6	8	4
Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980												
Favor	38	42	43	32	40	43	24	37	28	40	32	15
Oppose	35	31	36	35	49	57	71	61	70	51	59	79
Not sure	27	27	21	33	11	-	5	2	2	9	9	6
Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption												
Favor	34	43	32	38	57	58	43	37	21	28	44	38
Oppose	48	40	53	47	34	34	52	53	72	64	45	50
Not sure	18	17	15	15	9	8	5	10	7	8	11	12
Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution												
Favor	20	26	23	24	15	25	39	67	17	15	13	6
Oppose	71	65	72	69	77	73	56	29	74	83	87	94
Not sure	9	9	5	7	8	2	5	4	9	2	-	-

XX = not asked in 1975

Q.4

Table 31
FAVOR/OPPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Speed up the development of solar energy for power						
Favor	82	90	100	84	96	93
Oppose	4	4	-	16	2	5
Not sure	14	6	-	-	2	2
Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline						
Favor	77	80	90	84	77	38
Oppose	12	11	10	9	23	42
Not sure	11	9	-	7	-	20
Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states						
Favor	65	62	72	76	72	34
Oppose	17	19	25	21	28	63
Not sure	18	19	3	3	-	3
Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts						
Favor	64	59	87	90	85	47
Oppose	22	29	9	5	15	42
Not sure	14	12	4	5	-	11
Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants						
Favor	62	68	62	91	68	25
Oppose	21	22	34	9	30	71
Not sure	17	10	4	-	2	4
Allow more strip mining of coal						
Favor	49	50	68	84	72	36
Oppose	36	37	30	16	26	56
Not sure	15	13	2	-	2	8
Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980						
Favor	38	43	40	24	28	32
Oppose	35	36	49	71	70	59
Not sure	27	21	11	5	2	9
Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption						
Favor	34	32	57	43	21	44
Oppose	48	53	34	52	72	45
Not sure	18	15	9	5	7	11
Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution						
Favor	20	23	15	39	17	13
Oppose	71	72	77	56	74	87
Not sure	9	5	8	5	9	-

SECTION II:

THE PROS AND CONS OF NUCLEAR POWER

An In Depth Look at the Negatives

Concerns about a number of the risks connected with nuclear power have risen some since 1975, despite the fact that a substantial majority of 62-21% of the public favor a speeding up of construction of nuclear plants. As the subject of extension of nuclear energy as a main source of electric power has been aired and debated, the concerns have not dissipated.

In this survey, seven concerns emerge:

Table 33

--By 67-19%, a sizable majority of the public express the view that "the disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come" is a "major problem." This is up slightly from a 63-21% majority who felt the same way back in 1975. In nuclear power communities, apprehension over radioactive waste disposal has moved in the other direction, going down from 66-20% in 1975 to a current 55-36%. However, sizable majorities of all the leadership groups surveyed express real concern about this area: by 85-15%, political leaders share this worry; by 68-32%, business leaders feel it; by 79-21%, regulators express it; and environmentalists feel most strongly by a division of 93-7%.

Table 34

Observation:

Certainly,by any measure, both the public and the leadership groups feel the major unfinished business in nuclear power development is to come up with an answer to the problem of radioactive waste disposal. There is a depth of feeling that adequate and permanent steps simply have not been taken to properly dispose of nuclear wastes.

--By 57-31%, the public now feels that "the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere" is a major problem connected with nuclear power. This has risen among the public from a 49-36% plurality who felt the same way in 1975. Residents of communities which have nuclear power plants tend to reject this area as a problem by 54-40%, labeling it at worst as a "minor problem," a turnaround from the 47-41% plurality who expressed worry about radioactive leakage into the atmosphere in 1975. The leadership groups tend to go along with the judgment of the nuclear plant neighbors rather than the public as a whole, with political, business, and regulatory leaders all convinced by 70-30% margins that it is not a major question. By a narrow 53-47%, environmentalists tend to feel that it is.

--By 56-31%, the public also believes that "the chance that the escape of radioactive material can affect human life, causing deformed babies and other physical abnormalities" is a "major problem" with nuclear power. Again, by 48-45%, a plurality of residents in nuclear communities do not feel this way. And, by almost identical 3-1 majorities, political, business, and regulatory leaders tend to go along with nuclear community residents rather than the public as a whole. Again, however, a 55-43% majority of environmentalists agree with the public and express apprehension over the impact of escaped radioactive material on human life.

--By 54-36%, the public also expresses worry about "the chance of an explosion in the case of an accident" as a "major problem" connected with nuclear power, up from a closer 47-41% plurality which felt that way back in 1975. Again, nuclear power community residents deny this claim by 54-41%, a turnaround from a 45-45% stand-off on the issue over

a year ago. The total leadership group, in this instance, tends to agree with the nuclear power neighbors rather than the public: by 81-19%, a majority of political leaders do not see this as a major problem, a view shared by an 82-16% majority of business leaders, a 91-9% majority of regulators, and a 65-34% majority of environmentalists.

By 50-39%, most of the public see "the discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life" as a "major problem" with nuclear power, up only slightly from a 47-41% plurality who felt identically in 1975. Again, the shift in attitudes has gone in an opposite direction in the nuclear power communities themselves, with a 53-40% majority rejecting the claim that this is a major concern, down from 47-45% who felt it was in 1975. Again, the leadership goes along with the nuclear neighbor group rather than the general public: by 66-34%, a majority of political leaders do not see the thermal pollution charge as a major one; by 77-23%, business leaders share that point of view; and by 70-30%, regulators also agree that it is not a major concern. However, environmentalists part company with the other leaders and by 60-36% see thermal pollution as a major concern.

--"The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants" is believed by a razor thin 45-44% plurality among the public to be a "major problem" connected with nuclear power. By 48-39%, a plurality did not think such security threats were a major concern in 1975. However, among nuclear community residents, a wide 62-31% majority simply do not see sabotage as an important issue, up from a 50-41% division who felt that way in 1975. By margins of 2 to 1 or better, political, business, and regulatory leaders agree with the nuclear community residents. But

environmentalists do not agree with them and share the apprehensions of the public by 57-43%.

--By 45-38%, a plurality of the public also feel that a "major problem" connected with nuclear power is "the chance that a nuclear power plant could melt down and release radioactive clouds that could contaminate hundreds of square miles." A substantial 55-31% majority in the nuclear power communities disagree with the general public. So do most of the leadership surveyed: political leaders disagree with the charge by 72-28%, business leaders by 83-14%, and regulators by 79-21%. Environmentalists are sharply split on this issue, just giving credence to the melt down claim by 51-49%.

Two claimed disadvantages of nuclear power are rejected by all groups across the boards as a "major problem":

--By a close 45-43%, a plurality of the public are not seriously concerned with nuclear power plants "giving off fumes that can pollute the air," less than the 47-36% plurality that felt the same way back in 1975. In nuclear power communities, residents reject the air pollution argument by 58-34%, a slight increase from the 55-34% majority who rejected it in 1975. Political leaders also reject the pollution claim against nuclear power by 89-11%, as do business leaders by 83-16%, regulators by 95-2%, and environmentalists by 80-16%.

--"The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries" is rejected as a "major" concern by a 44-41% plurality of the public. A slightly larger 47-34% plurality turned down this claim in 1975. Again, in nuclear power communities, a substantial 66-26% majority are not seriously

concerned with the theft of plutonium as a "major" issue, up significantly from a 49-34% plurality who felt the same in 1975. Political leaders also reject this claim by 60-40%, business leaders by 77-23%, and regulators by 68-32%. However, environmentalists give some credence to it by 54-45%.

In analyzing the key groups in the public on this series of perceived disadvantages and risks connected with nuclear power, the division of the public by education is revealing. As one moves up the education scale, on almost every risk element tested, the lower are the concerns about the dangers of nuclear power. For example, the possibility of radical revolutionaries stealing plutonium is a major concern among 46% of the people with the least education, but among only 30% of those who have finished college. Similarly, worries about air pollution from nuclear plants is expressed by 47% of the least well educated, but no more than 34% of the best educated. The threat of sabotage of nuclear power plants is a major worry among 53% of the least well educated, but a much lower 35% of the college educated.

However, on one score, concern among the college educated rises well above the rest: on the dangers of not properly disposing of radioactive wastes, a major concern with 71% of the college graduate group but among only 60% of the least well educated group.

Observation:

Among the public, there are a number of genuine concerns and worries about the perceived dangers connected with nuclear power as a major source of energy for electric power. The most serious, both in intensity and in volume, is that of disposal of radioactive wastes.

But a number of others have at least limited credibility with the public, including the potential escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere, the chances of radioactive materials deforming human life, and the chance of an explosion in the case of an accident. All are viewed by the public as a whole as major dangers.

It must be noted, of course, that the perceived dangers of nuclear power are much greater among the public which has not had the personal experience of either living with nuclear power (only 3% say it is the main source of electric power energy in their community) or having been subjected to a wide-ranging discussion on the issue, than among people who live in communities which have nuclear power generation or among political, business or regulatory leaders, all of whom have been involved in more intensive discussion on the subject. Of course, environmentalists, who have also been exposed to extensive dialogues on the subject, tend to hold the same views as most of the public in terms of the perceived dangers from nuclear power.

A Safety Bottom Line Dimension

Despite the caveats felt by the public about the perceived dangers of nuclear power generation, when asked to estimate just how safe nuclear power plants are, 25% said they were "very safe," another 38% "somewhat safe," 16% "not so safe," and 7% said "dangerous." On a dichotomous basis, this would give nuclear power a 63-23% favorable rating on the safety dimension from the public. This compares with a 64-18% favorable rating in 1975, or a slight slippage since that time.

Table 37

Table 38

By key groups in the public, high marks on safety for nuclear plants have gone up in the South, but have declined marginally in the other three major regions of the country, resulting in a net minor loss. Among the pivotal college graduate group, confidence in the safety of

nuclear plants has gone from 76-18% positive in 1975 to 68-26% positive in 1976. Women give nuclear plants only a 55-26% positive score, compared with a like 57-20% in 1975, while men weigh in with a much higher 72-20% positive rating, scarcely changed from the 73-15% positive standing in 1975.

Residents of communities with nuclear power plants give a positive safety rating to atomic installations by a 76-16% margin. Political leaders rate nuclear safety at 81-19% positive, business leaders at an even higher 95-5%, and regulators at 87-13%. Significantly, environmentalists say that nuclear power plants are safe by a 53-45% edge.

Table 39

When probed for their reasoning on this key dimension of safety, the dominant feeling among those who believe they are safe is that they "hear the safety record of nuclear plants is good," volunteered by 15%; that "there are many precautions taken to keep them safe" (7%); "the scientists who work on them take great care" (6%); "I've read they are safe" (6%); "they wouldn't be built if not safe" (4%); and "they are handled properly and therefore are safe" (4%). Basically, people are saying that enough time, care, and precautions are taken so that essential safety is achieved in nuclear power plants.

Table 41

The minority who worry that the plants are not safe volunteered that "we don't know all the consequences from nuclear power" (9%); "there is a danger from radiation and leakage" (7%); "there is a danger of explosions and accidents" (7%); and "nothing is foolproof" (5%). Fear of the unknown clearly leads a 23% minority of the public to conclude that nuclear power is unsafe.

Observation:

Despite all of the concerns about radioactive waste disposal, accidents, and other concerns which surfaced earlier in this analysis, on balance every single major group surveyed concluded that nuclear power plants are more safe than unsafe. The heart of this conviction is partly confidence in the fact that nuclear power plants would not be brought in unless inordinate and thorough care were taken in their construction and in a whole series of fail-safes to make certain that potential dangers are aborted.

One of the singular marks of public opinion on the nuclear power question is that people express concern over potential hazards, but at the same time draw the conclusion that the plants are safe.

This is a critical turning point in understanding the views of the public and the leadership. For, if this safety threshold were not passed in the public's mind, then it is unlikely that approval for further nuclear development would be forthcoming.

The Potential Positive Attributes of Nuclear Power

Table 43

Out of 10 potential advantages which advocates of nuclear power have cited as reasons why the country should turn to this form of energy for its electric power in the future, all 10 are viewed in a positive light by the American people.

At the top of the list is "having nuclear power plants which would produce cheaper electric power," named as a "major advantage" by 77% of the public, a "minor advantage" by an additional 10%, and as "no advantage at all" by only 5%. Thus, by 77-15%,a lopsided majority of the public potentially associate abundant nuclear power with definite and distinct cost

Table 44

advantages. This division has scarcely changed from 1975, when a 79-13%

majority shared the same view. This advantage of nuclear power is held by an even higher 78-16% majority among nuclear community neighbors, by a 64-36% majority of political leaders, an 81-19% majority of business leaders, and a 57-40% majority of regulators. Only environmentalists demur by a slim margin of 47-46% on the potential cost advantages of nuclear power.

--Tied closely to the top reason is another which states, "Once constructed, nuclear power plants would produce less expensive electricity," a view held by a 71-16% majority of the public, again hardly changed from the 75-13% majority who felt the same way in 1975. Large majorities of nuclear community residents, political, business, and regulatory leaders, and even a 51-45% majority of environmentalists agree with this appeal of nuclear power.

Observation:

At a time of rapidly escalating energy costs, the potential appeal of relatively less expensive energy from nuclear sources is much on the minds of the American people and the leadership group.

Two other perceived possible advantages of nuclear power rank high in public credibility, both dealing with the potential impact of nuclear energy on relieving the energy shortage:

--By 71-14%, a majority of the public see a potential advantage in "eventually, nuclear power plants using the same energy over and over again, eliminating any future shortage of energy to produce electric power." In 1975, a like 74-11% majority felt the same way. Once again,

majorities of nuclear community residents, political leaders, business leaders, regulatory agency heads, and environmentalists (by a lesser 54-40%) agree with this advantage of nuclear power.

--By 71-18%, a sizable majority of the public also see real potential advantage in "building more nuclear power plants to avoid a serious shortage of electric power in the country." Majorities of all groups surveyed agree with this appeal of nuclear power, except for environmentalists, who demur by a close 54-45%.

Observation:

On the problem of potential supply, nuclear power has another potential powerful appeal. As a resource that can be made renewable, nuclear power appears to be a welcome alternative to oil and gas, which appear to many to be running out in terms of the world supply.

Other key advantages of nuclear power which majorities of the public perceive as adding to its appeal are:

--By 64-21%, a majority of the public see real advantage in "nuclear plants operating more efficiently than other types of electric power plants," scarcely changed from a 68-18% majority which felt the same in 1975. Nuclear power community residents feel the same way by a 72-17% margin, as do political leaders by 54-44%, business leaders by 68-30%, and regulators by 53-43%. Environmentalists disagree by a clear 56-34%.

--By 62-25%, a majority of the public see an advantage in "nuclear power plants creating no pollution of the air and water, such as that created by electric power plants using oil or coal." A

comparable 63-23% majority felt the same back in 1975. Sizable majorities of nuclear plant neighbors, political, business, and regulatory leaders all see this low pollution attribute as a real appeal of nuclear power plants. However, environmentalists disagree, by a narrow 47-44%.

--By 59-27%, a majority see nuclear power plants as "a major peaceful benefit from all the money this country has spent on atomic energy," not far different from the 65-21% majority who felt the same way back in 1975 among the public. A majority of 58-34% of nuclear community residents agree, as do a 34-66% majority of political leaders, an 65-35% majority of business leaders, and a 45-53% majority of regulators. Environmentalists disagree by 57-40%.

The location and economic growth advantages of nuclear power plant development also meet with generally favorable response:

--A 60-30% majority see a definite advantage in "a nuclear power plant attracting new industry to an area and creating more jobs," comparable to the 66-25% majority of the public which felt the same in 1975. Sizable majorities of all of the other key groups also view this as an advantage in nuclear power growth. Again, however, environmentalists are an exception, not seeing it as an advantage by 55-43%.

--The concept of "locating nuclear power plants in undeveloped areas of the country where new industry can be built and new cities built" is viewed as an advantage by a 54-34% majority of the public, almost identical to the 56-31% majority who felt that way in 1975. Majorities of nuclear neighbors, political, business, and regulatory leaders all see this as an advantage. Environmentalists do not by a 63-36% margin.

--Finally, a 68-22% majority of the public see an advantage in "building nuclear power plants away from heavily residential areas and still bringing cheaper power to people where they live," close to the 72-19% margin recorded in 1975. Again, sizable majorities of all groups except the environmentalists see advantages in locating new nuclear plants in relatively uninhabited areas, but with the power benefits being brought to people in populous centers.

Observation:

Taken as a whole, both the public and leadership responses to this roster of suggested advantages of nuclear power are impressive under any conditions. It is apparent that nuclear power appeals primarily because it holds out an answer to an American society that has become apprehensive about both the cost of energy and a supply that appears to be running out. On both the promises of keeping energy costs within bounds and in ample supply, nuclear power has powerful appeal.

Nuclear energy is also viewed as having an impact on economic growth and development, with a perceived positive effect on jobs, new industry, and whole new communities. It is also seen as environmentally advantageous to some of the other alternatives, especially coal.

Given the positive rating on the key safety dimension, nuclear power comes through as a relatively appealing form of energy to depend on for generation of electric power in the future. That is why more Americans think their own communities will depend on it in the future than any other form of energy to meet electric power needs

The Comparative Advantages of Oil, Coal, and Nuclear Power

While each major source of energy to be used for electric power may have its advantages and its deterrents, in the end, the

American society must make a deliberate choice to meet its energy and electric power needs.

Table 45

On 9 key dimensions, the public was asked to attribute or not to oil, coal, and nuclear power a capability to fulfill that objective. The following table shows just how dominant is the choice of nuclear power on these cutting dimensions:

KEY ENERGY ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED BY PUBLIC WITH OIL, COAL, AND NUCLEAR POWER

	Nuclear Power %	Coal %	Oil %
Can be obtained almost entirely within U.S.			
1976	73	70	36
1975	73	69	38
Makes us less dependent on foreign sources			
1976	73	66	37
1975	76	69	40
Is reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run			
1976	63	40	26
1975	66	42	30
Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities			
1976	63	48	26
1975	65	44	28
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much			
1976	60	14	25
1975	57	10	24
Will not run out of supply anytime soon in future			
1976	51	41	33
1975	53	45	33
Will be a cheaper form of energy in future than now			
1975	50	27	15
1975	53	28	18
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much			
1976	46	27	24
1975	44	24	24
Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it			
1976	34	40	46
1975	36	39	45

On fully 8 out of the 9 key dimensions, nuclear power is believed to better fulfill that attribute than either coal or oil. Nuclear power is particularly strong in solving the ultimate domestic supply source problem, and eliminating U.S. dependence on foreign sources. It is also viewed as being capable of being produced in unlimited quantities into the future, and therefore is a reliable form of energy for the country to depend on in the long run. In addition, nuclear power wins hands down on the air and water pollution control problems. Finally, it is seen as a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is today, far more than is the case with either coal or oil.

The one area in which nuclear power does not win is that of "raising few health hazards and dangers in using it," where nuclear power is regarded by no more than 34% as having that attribute, compared with 40% for coal and a higher 46% for oil. However, no source of energy scores over the 50% mark in the health hazard element, in contrast with nuclear power which came out ahead with over 50% on almost every one of the other dimensions.

Observation:

> There is no doubt from these results that on a relative, comparative basis, nuclear power appears to be a much more viable and acceptable alternative to the American people than either coal or oil.

Satisfying the Apprehensions About Nuclear Power

In order to test possible amelioratives to the apprehensions about nuclear power, the public and the leadership groups were asked a series of questions which placed conditions on some of the more sensitive

concerns people have:

Table 47

--By 72-16%, a sizable majority of the public opt for "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal." In 1975, an even higher 79-11% thought such a condition was "worth the risk." Among people who live in

Table 48

nuclear communities, 81% say this risk is worth taking, a view shared by 87% of the political leaders, 93% of the business leaders, and 87% of the regulators. However, no more than 42% of the environmentalists are willto take this risk even if "tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal are met."

--A 70-17% majority of the public feel it is worth taking the risk of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government certifies that they will not pollute the air and water." An 80-11% majority felt the same way last year. Majorities of all the other groups also feel this is a worthwhile risk to take, although, once again, no more than 34% of the environmentalists feel this way.

--By 70-19%, a majority of the public are willing to take the risk of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government regularly inspects the plants to be sure there is no radioactive leakage." A 79-11% majority felt the same way a year earlier. Majorities of over 8 out of 10 people who live in nuclear communities, political leaders, business leaders, and regulators all also feel it is worth the risk with this kind of guarantee. No more than 38% of the environmentalists are willing to assume such a risk, however.

--By 69-18%, a majority of the public feel it is worth taking the risk of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants have

proper security to prevent the stealing of plutonium or the sabotage of the plants by revolutionaries." A 75-13% majority felt identically in 1975. Again, a majority of all the other major groups surveyed concur in taking this risk, although environmentalists do not.

--By 68-19%, a majority of the public feel that a risk well worth taking is to "allow nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants are prohibited from dumping warm water into streams and lakes that could endanger fish and other water life." A 76-14% majority felt the same back in 1975. Higher majorities of nuclear neighbors, political leaders, business leaders, and regulators all concur in feeling the risk is well worth taking. However, no more than 41% of the environmentalists go along with that point of view.

--Finally, by 67-21%, a majority of the public feel that a worthwhile risk would be "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government is satisfied on inspection that an accidental explosion is unlikely to happen." A 75-15% majority felt the same in 1975. Once more, majorities of over 7 in every 10 of nuclear neighbors, political leaders, business leaders, and regulators go along with the public on being willing to assume this risk. However, no more than 36% of the environmentalists agree.

Observation:

With nuclear power for electric power thought to be cheaper and more abundant in the long run, and with it qualifying as a source of supply unlikely to run out, in the judgment of the American people it is a source of major energy dependence in the future. However, the public and most of the leadership groups surveyed also would feel much more secure about extending construction of

nuclear plants if tight regulations and inspections were made by government to insure that major safety hazards have been taken into account and that the probability of such problems will be minimized. Throughout, however, environmentalists demur and will not consent to the risks involved in nuclear power building, even though a majority of them agree with the rest that, on balance, nuclear power is safe.

Q.7c

Table 32

TWO OR THREE MAIN DISADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
(Answers volunteered)

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Unsafe, dangerous, health hazard	25	19	28	24	28	46
Danger of radiation contamination, leaks, cracks in reactor	21	23	11	9	6	7
Danger of accidents, explosions, earthquakes	16	23	17	16	23	21
Problems with radioactive waste disposal	13	17	53	34	55	45
Pollution, damage to environment, wild life	10	9	8	14	9	13
Thermal pollution, kills marine life	8	14	17	21	17	13
Initial expense is high; financing problems	8	7	15	26	21	14
Expensive, high cost	7	4	25	26	15	29
Lack of technical knowledge, uncertainty of consequences	7	5	9	10	13	7
Need stringent controls, safeguards	7	3	9	10	9	13
Danger of sabotage	5	5	13	2	13	13
Public anxiety over safety; objections of environmental groups	4	6	25	28	13	4
Shortage, lack of plutonium	2	2	11	5	15	11
Sites not available	1	3	-	2	4	-
Danger to workers in nuclear plants	1	-	-	-	-	2
Puts people out of work	1	1	2	-	-	-
Inefficient, breaks down	1	-	8	3	2	13
Fuel getting into wrong hands; theft of plutonium	-	-	23	3	9	11
Proliferation of nuclear power creates problems	-	-	8	2	-	7
Length of construction time	-	-	6	-	2	2
Human carelessness, error	-	-	-	-	2	4
Prefer alternative sources of energy (solar, coal, etc.)	-	-	-	2	-	4
Government bureaucracy	-	-	-	3	2	-
Adverse political and social implications	-	-	-	-	-	4
Exempted by government from liability claims, insurance coverage	-	-	2	-	-	-
All other answers	8	10	4	14	17	7
None, no disadvantages	8	12	2	7	-	2
Don't know	20	13	-	-	-	-

Q.7k

Table 33
PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come						
Major problem	67	55	85	68	79	93
Minor problem	14	20	15	23	17	5
Hardly a problem at all	5	16	-	9	4	2
Not sure	14	9	-	-	-	-
The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere						
Major problem	57	40	30	30	30	53
Minor problem	17	21	40	21	34	18
Hardly a problem at all	14	33	30	49	36	29
Not sure	12	6	-	-	-	-
The chance that the escape of radioactive material can affect human life, causing deformed babies and other physical abnormalities						
Major problem	56	45	26	25	26	55
Minor problem	18	19	40	23	36	20
Hardly a problem at all	13	29	32	51	38	23
Not sure	13	7	2	1	-	2
The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident						
Major problem	54	41	19	16	9	34
Minor problem	24	30	36	39	41	36
Hardly a problem at all	12	24	45	43	50	29
Not sure	10	5	-	2	-	1
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life						
Major problem	50	40	34	23	30	60
Minor problem	27	33	53	47	59	25
Hardly a problem at all	12	20	13	30	11	11
Not sure	11	7	-	-	-	4

(continued)

Q.7k

Table 33

PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
(continued)

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Politiacl Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environ-mentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants						
Major problem	45	31	34	19	23	57
Minor problem	31	34	55	58	53	34
Hardly a problem at all	13	28	11	23	21	9
Not sure	11	7	-	-	3	-
The chance that a nuclear power plant could melt down and release radioactive clouds that could contaminate hundreds of square miles						
Major problem	45	31	28	14	21	51
Minor problem	20	23	38	32	43	27
Hardly a problem at all	18	32	34	51	36	22
Not sure	17	14	-	3	-	-
Giving off fumes that can pollute the air						
Major problem	43	34	11	16	2	16
Minor problem	23	26	43	16	40	32
Hardly a problem at all	22	32	46	68	55	48
Not sure	12	8	-	-	3	4
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries						
Major problem	41	26	40	23	32	54
Minor problem	27	35	54	44	51	36
Hardly a problem at all	17	31	6	33	17	9
Not sure	15	8	-	-	-	1

Q.7k

Table 34
PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come				
Major problem	67	63	55	66
Minor problem	14	14	20	15
Hardly a problem at all	5	7	16	5
Not sure	14	16	9	14
The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere				
Major problem	57	49	40	47
Minor problem	17	19	21	19
Hardly a problem at all	14	17	33	22
Not sure	12	15	6	12
The chance that the escape of radioactive materials can affect human life, causing deformed babies and other physical abnormalities				
Major problem	56	XX	45	XX
Minor problem	18	XX	19	XX
Hardly a problem at all	13	XX	29	XX
Not sure	13	XX	7	XX
The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident				
Major problem	54	47	41	45
Minor problem	24	28	30	25
Hardly a problem at all	12	13	24	20
Not sure	10	12	5	10
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life				
Major problem	50	47	40	47
Minor problem	27	28	33	27
Hardly a problem at all	12	13	20	18
Not sure	11	12	7	8

(Continued)

XX = Not asked in 1975.

Q.7k

Table 34
PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS (Continued)

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors	
	1976	1975	1976	1975
	%	%	%	%
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants				
Major problem	45	39	31	41
Minor problem	31	32	34	26
Hardly a problem at all	13	16	28	24
Not sure	11	13	7	9
The chance that a nuclear power plant could melt down and release radioactive clouds that could contaminate hundreds of square miles				
Major problem	45	XX	31	XX
Minor problem	20	XX	23	XX
Hardly a problem at all	18	XX	32	XX
Not sure	17	XX	14	XX
Giving off fumes that can pollute the air				
Major problem	43	36	34	34
Minor problem	23	26	26	19
Hardly a problem at all	22	21	32	36
Not sure	12	17	8	11
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries				
Major problem	41	34	26	34
Minor problem	27	29	35	21
Hardly a problem at all	17	18	31	28
Not sure	15	19	8	17

XX = Not asked in 1975.

Q.7k(1)

Table 35
"MAJOR" PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Mid- East %	Mid- west %	South %	West %	Cities %	Sub- urbs %	Towns %	Rural %	18- 29 %	30- 49 %	50 and Over %	Some High School Or Less %	High School Graduate/ Some College %	College Graduate %	Building More Nuclear Power Plants in U.S. Favor %	Oppose %
The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come	67	67	68	61	75	71	68	59	66	75	64	64	60	70	71	61	86
The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere	57	61	57	56	51	61	59	51	53	68	55	51	56	60	49	47	81
The chance that the escape of radioactive materials can affect human life, causing deformed babies and other physical abnormalities	56	60	58	52	49	59	56	53	52	64	52	53	57	57	49	44	82
The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident	54	60	55	49	47	57	56	49	49	58	52	52	58	55	45	42	80
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life	50	55	48	49	48	56	49	49	45	59	46	47	51	51	50	41	72
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants	45	48	43	46	45	50	47	42	40	41	43	51	53	45	35	39	63
The chance that a nuclear power plant could melt down and release radioactive clouds that could contaminate hundreds of square miles	45	49	44	46	39	49	47	45	38	50	40	46	51	47	32	35	70
Giving off fumes that can pollute the air	43	45	43	42	40	50	41	41	38	54	39	38	47	44	34	34	64
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries	41	42	41	41	41	46	42	40	36	37	39	47	46	43	30	36	58

Q.7k
(L-Q.17a)

Table 36
"MAJOR" PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by: Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come	67	66	71	72	67
The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere	57	54	64	47	42
The chance that the escape of radioactive materials can affect human life, causing deformed babies and other physical abnormalities	56	45	66	47	47
The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident	54	51	60	34	46
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life	50	26	40	11	15
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants	45	40	41	28	33
The chance that a nuclear power plant could melt down and release radioactive clouds that could contaminate hundreds of square miles	45	47	59	32	42
Giving off fumes that can pollute the air	43	17	33	19	20
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries	41	58	38	36	40

7m(1)

Table 37
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Very Safe %	Somewhat Safe %	Not So Safe %	Dangerous (Volunteered) %	Not Sure %
Total Public	25	38	16	7	14
East	21	36	21	6	16
Midwest	25	38	15	8	14
South	20	46	11	9	14
West	37	32	15	8	8
Some H.S. or less	19	36	16	9	20
H.S. grad/some college	25	41	15	6	13
College grad	32	36	17	9	6
Men	34	38	14	6	8
Women	16	39	17	9	19
Favor more nucplants in U.S.	39	46	7	1	7
Oppose more nucplants in U.S.	4	24	40	26	6
Total Nucplant Neighbors	42	34	13	3	8
Indian Point, N.Y.	24	39	19	5	13
Morris, Ill.	40	36	10	5	9
San Onofre, Calif.	59	27	10	-	4

Q.7m

Table 38
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	1976					1975				
	Very Safe %	Some-what Safe %	Not So Safe %	Dan-gerous (vol.) %	Not Sure %	Very Safe %	Some-what Safe %	Not So Safe %	Dan-gerous (vol.) %	Not Sure %
Total Public	25	38	16	7	14	26	38	13	5	18
East	21	36	21	6	16	26	36	16	6	16
Midwest	25	38	15	8	14	22	45	12	6	15
South	20	46	11	9	14	25	36	12	3	24
West	37	32	15	8	8	32	38	9	6	15
Some high school/ less	19	36	16	9	20	19	34	14	4	29
High school graduate/ come college	25	41	15	6	13	28	41	12	6	13
College graduate	32	36	17	9	6	35	41	10	8	6
Men	34	38	14	6	8	38	35	10	5	12
Women	16	39	17	9	19	15	42	15	5	23
Favor building more nuclear power plants in U.S.	39	46	7	1	7	39	45	5	1	10
Oppose building more nuclear power plants in U.S.	4	24	40	26	6	4	31	34	22	9

Q.7m

Table 39
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very safe	25	42	53	74	55	23
Somewhat safe	38	34	28	21	32	30
Not so safe	16	13	17	3	11	32
Dangerous (vol.)	7	3	2	2	2	13
Not sure	14	8	-	-	-	2

Q.7m
(L-Q.17b)

Table 40
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by: Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Very safe	25	21	7	21	9
Somewhat safe	38	52	71	56	60
Not so safe	16	25	17	23	27
Dangerous (vol.)	7	-	5	-	-
Not sure	14	2	-	-	4

Q.7n

Table 41
WHY FEEL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS ARE SAFE/UNSAFE

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Reasons Why Nuclear Power Plants Are Safe						
Haven't heard of any accidents; record of plants is good	15	24	28	41	23	23
There are many precautions, efforts to keep them safe	7	13	25	38	28	7
I have confidence in people, scientists who work in them	6	10	11	24	17	4
I've read, heard they are safe	6	5	13	14	6	11
They wouldn't be built if not safe; they must be safe	4	4	4	14	-	-
I just feel they're safe; not worried	4	4	2	5	6	4
They're safe as long as handled properly; as long as precautions are taken	4	2	2	-	2	2
They must conform to government (AEC) regulations and controls	3	5	11	7	28	2
They are improving, getting safer all the time	3	1	-	-	2	-
No fumes; don't pollute	1	3	2	2	-	-
I, relative, friend work(ed) in nuclear plant	1	2	-	-	-	-
The only problem is waste disposal; fish killed	1	1	6	-	2	2
I live near one	1	7	-	2	-	-
I don't believe arguments/groups against the safety of nuclear power plants	1	*	6	2	2	4
All other reasons why safe	5	5	-	-	2	-
Reasons Why Nuclear Power Plants Are Unsafe						
Don't know all the consequences, how safe or dangerous it is; need more research	9	3	4	5	6	14
Danger of radiation, leakage	7	9	6	-	4	13
Danger of explosions, accidents, breakdowns	7	8	13	5	4	20
It's dangerous, unsafe	7	2	8	2	11	29
Nothing is foolproof; always chance of human error	5	8	6	2	6	13
Have read, heard about problems, dangers, etc.	5	4	6	3	6	13
Problems with radioactive wastes	4	4	8	3	15	16
Bad for environment; causes pollution	3	4	-	-	2	2
Danger of sabotage	2	1	2	3	2	13
Thermal pollution	1	2	-	-	-	5
It's like an atomic bomb	1	1	2	-	-	2
They won't tell us if something goes wrong	1	*	-	-	-	-
They are built in the wrong places/San Andreas fault, danger of earthquakes	1	1	2	-	2	4
Have had problems in plants around here	*	*	-	-	4	2
Health hazard, can cause cancer	*	*	8	2	7	11
Inadequate engineering, technical capabilities	-	-	8	2	6	11
Although nuclear energy causes fewer accidents, the consequences of accidents are worse	-	-	6	2	2	4
Problems in storage of hazardous material	-	-	2	-	2	4
Proliferation of nuclear power creates problems	-	-	2	-	-	2
Problems, accidents in transport of hazardous materials	-	-	-	-	2	-
Theft of radioactive materials for crime, blackmail	-	-	-	-	-	2
They don't take proper precautions	-	-	4	-	2	5
All other reasons why unsafe	4	4	6	3	2	5
Don't Know	10	9	-	-	-	-

Q.7d

Table 42
TWO OR THREE MAIN ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Cheap, produced more cheaply, less expensive to use	32	45	42	42	34	24
Clean energy, less pollution than gas, oil, coal	24	42	55	53	53	45
Unlimited supply, abundant source, reusable	19	17	43	42	47	33
More powerful, efficient; high output of energy	13	14	13	25	13	5
We need energy; good source of energy	11	9	6	4	4	2
Make U.S. independent of foreign oil	10	11	21	19	6	9
Alternative to oil, gas, coal	8	7	11	19	13	11
Cheaper in the long run	7	3	15	7	9	5
Helps save natural resources	4	8	6	14	2	4
More reliable, dependable	4	9	8	2	4	2
Would create jobs	3	3	-	-	-	-
Favor, if safe, properly controlled	3	2	2	-	-	-
It's available immediately	3	2	4	9	13	-
Progress; modern, advanced technology	2	4	9	2	4	-
It's safer; not dangerous	2	5	8	2	4	4
Compact, self-contained; less storage space necessary	1	2	-	-	4	-
Favor, if built away from populated areas	1	1	-	-	-	2
Could be built anywhere	*	1	2	5	6	2
Easy transportation of fuel	-	-	2	2	-	4
They'll solve waste disposal problems	-	*	2	-	2	-
All other answers	5	3	6	5	11	5
None, no advantages	7	5	2	-	4	25
Don't know	15	10	-	-	-	2

* Less than 0.5%

Q.7L

Table 43
ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Having nuclear power plants which produce cheaper electric power						
Major advantage	77	78	64	81	57	35
Minor advantage	10	12	25	12	17	11
No advantage at all	5	4	11	7	23	47
Not sure	8	6	-	-	3	7
Building more nuclear power plants to avoid a serious shortage of electric power in the country						
Major advantage	71	74	70	36	70	30
Minor advantage	11	14	15	7	13	15
No advantage at all	7	4	15	7	17	54
Not sure	11	8	-	-	-	1
Eventually, nuclear power plants using the same energy over and over again, eliminating any future shortage of energy to produce electric power						
Major advantage	71	73	66	82	68	43
Minor advantage	10	11	19	9	17	11
No advantage at all	4	5	9	5	11	40
Not sure	15	11	6	4	4	6
Once constructed, nulcear power plants producing less expensive electricity						
Major advantage	71	73	63	84	66	36
Minor advantage	10	12	25	7	11	15
No advantage at all	6	6	8	9	19	45
Not sure	13	9	4	-	4	4
Building nuclear power plants away from heavily residential areas and still bringing cheaper power to people where they live						
Major advantage	68	67	32	70	48	27
Minor advantage	16	21	42	19	26	18
No advantage at all	6	5	25	11	26	51
Not sure	10	7	1	-	-	4
Nuclear power plants operating more efficiently than other types of electric power plants						
Major advantage	64	72	54	68	53	25
Minor advantage	15	13	23	16	17	9
No advantage at all	6	4	21	14	26	56
Not sure	15	11	2	2	4	10
Nuclear power plants creating no pollution of the air and water, such as that created by electric power plants using oil or coal						
Major advantage	62	71	72	85	76	44
Minor advantage	16	18	19	12	15	20
No advantage at all	9	5	9	3	9	27
Not sure	13	6	-	-	-	9
A nuclear power plant attracting new industry to an area and creating more jobs						
Major advantage	60	62	11	55	30	18
Minor advantage	21	22	53	33	40	25
No advantage at all	9	10	34	12	30	55
Not sure	10	6	2	-	-	2
Nuclear power plants being a major peaceful benefit from all the money this country has spent on atomic energy						
Major advantage	59	58	34	65	45	19
Minor advantage	18	28	36	23	40	21
No advantage at all	9	6	30	12	13	57
Not sure	14	8	-	-	2	3
Locating nuclear power plants in undeveloped areas of the country where new industry can be built and new cities built						
Major advantage	54	56	13	45	23	13
Minor advantage	23	25	55	45	34	23
No advantage at all	11	10	32	10	43	63
Not sure	12	9	-	-	-	1

Q.7L

Table 44
ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER

	Total Public 1976 %	1975 %
Having nuclear power plants which produce cheaper electric power		
Major advantage	77	79
Minor advantage	10	10
No advantage at all	5	3
Not sure	8	8
Building more nuclear power plants to avoid a serious shortage of electric power in the country		
Major advantage	71	X
Minor advantage	11	X
No advantage at all	7	X
Not sure	11	X
Eventually, nuclear power plants using the same energy over and over again, eliminating any future shortage of energy to produce electric power		
Major advantage	71	74
Minor advantage	10	9
No advantage at all	4	2
Not sure	15	15
Once constructed, nuclear power plants producing less expensive electricity		
Major advantage	71	75
Minor advantage	10	9
No advantage at all	6	4
Not sure	13	12
Building nuclear power plants away from heavily residential areas and still bringing cheaper power to people where they live		
Major advantage	68	72
Minor advantage	16	15
No advantage at all	6	4
Not sure	10	9

(continued)

XX = Not asked in 1975.

Q.7L

Table 44
ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER (continued)

	Total Public 1976 %	1975 %
Nuclear power plants operating more efficiently than other types of electric power plants		
Major advantage	64	68
Minor advantage	15	13
No advantage at all	6	5
Not sure	15	14
Nuclear power plants creating no pollution of the air and water, such as that created by electric power plants using oil or coal		
Major advantage	62	63
Minor advantage	16	16
No advantage at all	9	7
Not sure	13	14
A nuclear power plant attracting new industry to an area and creating more jobs		
Major advantage	60	66
Minor advantage	21	18
No advantage at all	9	7
Not sure	10	9
Nuclear power plants being a major peaceful benefit from all the money this country has spent on atomic energy		
Major advantage	59	65
Minor advantage	18	16
No advantage at all	9	5
Not sure	14	14
Locating nuclear power plants in undeveloped areas of the country where new industry can be built and new cities built		
Major advantage	54	56
Minor advantage	23	21
No advantage at all	11	10
Not sure	12	13

Q.6a,b,c

Table 45
ADVANTAGES OF OIL, COAL AND NUCLEAR POWER
AS ENERGY SOURCES FOR ELECTRIC POWER
("Think so" only)

	Total Public	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it					
Oil	46	64	71	72	58
Coal	40	36	55	51	25
Nuclear power	34	51	60	43	29
Makes us less dependent on foreign sources					
Oil	37	25	36	23	25
Coal	66	98	86	94	89
Nuclear power	73	96	88	94	65
Can be obtained almost entirely within the United States					
Oil	36	6	11	11	9
Coal	70	96	95	98	95
Nuclear power	73	85	89	87	62
Will not run out of supply any time soon in the future					
Oil	33	28	33	30	33
Coal	41	75	67	57	66
Nuclear power	51	75	72	51	45
Is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run					
Oil	26	4	23	11	9
Coal	40	77	80	74	69
Nuclear power	63	62	82	68	31
Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities					
Oil	26	2	9	6	9
Coal	48	81	78	57	57
Nuclear power	63	55	81	57	47
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much					
Oil	25	36	49	45	41
Coal	14	9	21	17	8
Nuclear power	60	79	93	74	51
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much					
Oil	24	58	64	60	36
Coal	27	38	53	34	31
Nuclear power	46	53	76	53	17
Will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now					
Oil	15	2	7	4	-
Coal	27	23	26	17	21
Nuclear power	50	40	57	36	18

Q.6a,b,c

Table 46

TREND OF ADVANTAGES OF OIL, COAL, AND NUCLEAR ENERGY SOURCES FOR ELECTRIC POWER
("Think so" only)

	Total Public		
	1976 %	1975 %	Change %
Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it			
Oil	46	45	+1
Coal	40	39	+1
Nuclear power	34	36	-2
Makes us less dependent on foreign sources			
Oil	37	40	-3
Coal	66	69	-3
Nuclear power	73	76	-3
Can be obtained almost entirely within the United States			
Oil	36	38	-2
Coal	70	69	+1
Nuclear power	73	73	-
Will not run out of supply any time soon in the future			
Oil	33	33	-
Coal	41	45	-4
Nuclear power	51	53	-2
Is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run			
Oil	26	30	-4
Coal	40	42	-2
Nuclear power	63	66	-3
Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities			
Oil	26	28	-2
Coal	48	44	+4
Nuclear power	63	65	-2
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much			
Oil	25	24	+1
Coal	14	10	+4
Nuclear power	60	57	+3
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much			
Oil	24	24	-
Coal	27	24	+3
Nuclear power	46	44	+2
Will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now			
Oil	15	18	-3
Coal	27	28	-1
Nuclear power	50	53	-3

Q.7o

Table 47
RISKS WORTH TAKING

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal		
Worth risk	72	79
Not worth risk	16	11
Not sure	12	10
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government certifies that they will not pollute the air and water		
Worth risk	70	80
Not worth risk	17	11
Not sure	13	9
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government regularly inspects the plants to be sure there is no radioactive leakage		
Worth risk	70	79
Not worth risk	19	11
Not sure	11	10
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants have proper security to prevent the stealing of plutonium or the sabotage of the plants by revolutionaries		
Worth risk	69	75
Not worth risk	18	13
Not sure	13	12
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants are prohibited from dumping warm water into streams and lakes that could endanger fish and other water life		
Worth risk	68	76
Not worth risk	19	14
Not sure	13	10
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government is satisfied on inspection that an accidental explosion is unlikely to happen		
Worth risk	67	75
Not worth risk	21	15
Not sure	12	10

Q.7o

Table 48
RISKS WORTH TAKING

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal	72	81	87	93	87	42
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government certifies that they will not pollute the air and water	70	79	83	93	81	34
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government regularly inspects the plant to be sure there is no radioactive leakage	70	82	83	95	85	38
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants have proper security to prevent the stealing of plutonium or the sabotage of the plants by revolutionaries	69	78	87	93	87	41
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants are prohibited from dumping warm water into streams and lakes that could endanger fish and other water life	68	75	81	95	85	41
Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government is satisfied on inspection that an accidental explosion is unlikely to happen	67	78	79	91	79	36

SECTION III:

PATTERNS OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR POWER

Nuclear Power Development as a National Policy

Table 49

By close to a 3 to 1 margin, a 61-22% majority of the American people favor "the building of more nuclear power plants in the United

Table 50

States," barely changed from the 63-19% who felt the same way in 1975. Support among most of the rest of the key groups surveyed actually went up: among residents of nuclear communities, backing for building more nuclear power plants rose from 63-23% in 1975 to a current 70-21%; among political leaders, from 69-29% to 75-21% today; among business leaders, from 92-6% in favor to 93-7% in favor. An exception are regulators, who slipped from 75-19% in favor to a still substantial but lesser 70-28% in favor of building more nuclear plants.

The one group in the survey still solidly opposed to building more nuclear plants is environmentalists, by a current margin of 63-32%. However, in the 1975 study, environmentalists were a much more lopsided 77-19% opposed to nuclear power plant construction.

Among the public, where there has been a relatively insignificant 2-point drop in backing for and a 3-point rise in opposition to nuclear

Table 52

power plants nationwide, there are some interesting trends. While the South has not lost any ground, in all of the other regions there has been a 3 to 4-point drop in backing for nuclear power. In the West, dominated in population by California, support for nuclear power plant construction is 65-25% in the survey, not far off the results of the nuclear referendum taken there in June, albeit down from the 68-18% mark of 1975.

In big cities and the suburbs, there has been some fall off of support for nuclear power plant construction, but these losses have been somewhat offset by gains in backing in more rural areas. On an age basis,

younger people, although still 57-27% in favor of nuclear power, have slipped some 7 points in their backing, although those over 50 have remained overwhelmingly in favor by 63-17%. A comparable pattern is evident on an education basis: support among the college graduate group has dropped from 68-23% in 1975 to 57-31% this year, but below this educational level little change can be found. The disparity evident in 1975 between men and women emerges once again: with men 70-19% in favor of building more nuclear power plants, while women favor them by a much lower 52-25%.

In the nuclear communities, where such plants have been in operation for some time, support for nuclear power has risen across the boards: in Morris, Illinois, support has jumped from 58-25% in 1975 to a current 70-22%; in San Onofre, California, it has gone from 75-17% to 81-13% today; and in Indian Point, New York, where backing was 56-28%, it has essentially remained the same at 57-30%.

Observation:

While the patterns of internal support by key groups has been mixed in the trends, nonetheless the striking fact is that overall support for building more nuclear power plants in the United States has remained high and solid, as indicated by the 61-22% majority who favor such a policy. By and large, those who have had the most experience living with nuclear power have become even heavier backers of it. Undoubtedly daunted some by their experience in the California referendum, environmentalists have become more defensive in their opposition to nuclear power.

Nonetheless, among the college educated, young people, and the more affluent groups, support for nuclear power has also softened some, with slippage in backing ranging from 4 to 7 points with a commensurate

> rise in opposition; but substantial majorities can still be recorded in favor of it. These results would indicate that the dialogue over nuclear power is far from over, and doubts which have been raised must be faced with facts and sober reasoning. For many of the people doing the most serious questioning are among the better informed and more articulate sectors of the public and leadership.

When asked why they favor or oppose the building of more nuclear power plants, the public's most frequently volunteered answer summed up in many ways the dominant and essential argument going for nuclear power: "we're running out of other forms of energy, and nuclear is the one viable alternative left," cited by 18% of the public, 21% of the nuclear community residents, 47% of the political leaders, 28% of the business leaders, 28% of the regulators, and 11% of the environmentalists. Close behind, volunteered by 13% of the public, was the view that "nuclear power is cheaper, less expensive." Then came an expression of confidence that "nuclear is the future main source of energy" (9%) and "nuclear is cleaner, will pollute less than coal and other energy" (8%), "nuclear power can make us more self-sufficient on energy" (7%), and "nuclear power could be abundant and unlimited in supply" (6%).

Table 53

The litany of reasons for backing nuclear power, reviewed in depth earlier in this report, were chorused back by the public and other groups in this survey.

Table 54

The negative reasons for opposing nuclear power construction were also familiar: "it is a dangerous form of energy, posing health hazards" (14%), "worry over possible accidents, malfunctions" (4%), "possible radiation leakage" (3%). Environmentalists particularly are wor-

ried about radioactive waste disposal (29%) and they raise another newer and less often heard objection, "nuclear power is becoming too expensive" (23%), on a volunteered basis.

Observation:

When the public and the key leadership groups surveyed are asked to put in their own words their reasoning for wanting more nuclear power construction in the U.S., the line up of the logic and feelings people have is much the same as previously reported when questions were asked on a structured basis. Fundamentally, nuclear power for electric power supply is favored mainly because it appears increasingly to be the only intermediate run alternative to oil and natural gas, which are widely perceived to be running out, and to coal, which is not thought to be inexpensive anymore and which evokes serious environmental reservations. In addition, nuclear power is believed to be a relatively clean source of energy, satisfying antipollution requirements. Finally, it is seen ultimately as being virtually limitless in supply and also a potentially cheaper source of energy.

The negatives all center on the worries over potential health hazards, particularly the lack of known policy on radioactive waste disposal. Yet, when people weigh the dangers off against their perceived needs, they are inclined to label nuclear power "safe" and are willing to take the risks. However, it must be emphasized that this is not a kind of "status quo" decision, where people are talking about simply accepting nuclear power as it is in today's state of development. There are urgent and important messages in this study that the industry and the government can ignore only at their peril: that the public and leadership groups are expecting more safeguards and better fail-safes (especially in the radioactive waste disposal area) to be developed if the U.S. is to go the nuclear power route.

Nuclear Power in Your Own Community

In the 1975 survey, the public expressed a stronger desire to have more nuclear power plants built in the country than in their own individual communities. While a 63-19% majority favored reliance on nuclear power as a national policy, a smaller 54-24% majority favored having nuclear power "as the main source of energy for the electric power you use in your community." After a full discussion of the implications of nuclear power in their own community, when asked again how they felt, people nationwide still favored it 55-27% in 1975. On a comparable basis in 1976, support for nuclear power as a national policy has gone to 61-21%, while in the local community it has dropped to 49-31% prior to discussion of the implications of having it in their home areas and to 51-35% support after such discussion.

Tables 55, 6, 57

Table 58

Observation:

Throughout this survey in 1976, we have been able to observe some marginal slippage in backing for nuclear power development, albeit substantial majorities or pluralities in all cases still favor it, whether on a national or local community basis. But there is still much the same gap between support as a matter of national dependence and coming to face the reality of depending on nuclear power close to where people live. Support is there in both instances, but there is more reluctance to bite the bullet and install nuclear power in one's own community.

Table 59

The reasons volunteered for wanting nuclear power where they live parallel those given for backing a national pro-nuclear power policy: the economic advantages of keeping electric power rates from soaring as other energy sources rise in cost, a cleaner source of energy which is

less polluting, the potential of abundant supply, and "nuclear is the wave of the future in energy." The negatives all center on the worries for potential hazard to their own community.

Table 60

As in the case of building more nuclear plants nationside, residents of nuclear communities show an increase since 1975 in backing for local nuclear power construction. Curiously, environmentalists also show a marginal pick-up in support (from 22% to 27%), although a solid majority of 68% of them still oppose local construction of nuclear power plants. However, backing for local construction has declined a bit among political and business leaders, and among regulators support has dropped from 68-32% in 1975 to 46-41% in 1976.

Among the public, support for local dependence on nuclear power has declined in all regions. It should be pointed out that in every region of the country, clear pluralities or majorities still favor going the nuclear way. When analyzed by education, the biggest drop in support of community development of nuclear power has taken place among the college graduates. Further, the higher income groups, rather than lower income people, tend to show the most sizable drops in backing. Having said this, of course, pluralities or majorities of every educational and income group still favor local nuclear power development. As in the case of development of nuclear power as a national policy, women are much less inclined than men to favor community nuclear power plant construction, although a 41-33% plurality

still favor it, down from 43-27% in 1975.

In the nuclear power communities, Indian Point, N.Y. shows a decline from 54-30% to 48-34% in backing dependence on nuclear power locally. However, these losses are more than offset by a rise in Morris, Ill. from 57-25% in 1975 to 66-20% in 1976, and a comparable increase from 72-11% to 80-14% in behalf of local dependence on nuclear power in San Onofre, California.

Observation:

> The internal patterns of support for local community dependence on nuclear power development parallel to a large extent those on the issue of national emphasis on nuclear power. The more affluent groups, younger people, those with more education and the more articulate sectors all have dropped some in their backing, while older people, the less affluent, rural areas, and residents of nuclear communities tend to have firmed up their support. There is no doubt that questions have been raised about problems connected with nuclear power among the more affluent sectors of the public and leadership, which are genuine issues of concern. However, they have not reached a point of magnitude in terms of doubts to basically change either the national divisions or even the balance of opinion within these groups favoring both national and local nuclear power construction.

Many of the critical turning edges on which decisions over the advent of nuclear power locally will be determined surfaced in further probing in this survey. Five potential developments were tested to see the extent to which opposition to community nuclear construction could be

able 61

expected to mount:

--A substantial 82-7% majority of the public would oppose local nuclear construction if it were reported unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies, up from a 77-12% majority who felt the same back in 1975.

Table 62

--A 68-18% majority also would oppose local nuclear power building if "it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment," up from a 61-23% majority who said they would oppose such construction under similar conditions in 1975.

--A 53-31% majority said they would oppose local nuclear plant construction if their state government opposed it, up from a 42-35% plurality who felt the same back in 1975.

--A 52-33% majority would be opposed to local nuclear power development if their local government opposed it, up from a close 41-37% plurality who felt that way in 1975.

--Finally, a narrow 38-33% plurality said they would oppose community nuclear power construction if Ralph Nader opposed it. Back in 1975, by 39-28%, a plurality said they would not oppose such local construction if Nader opposed it.

Observation:

It is apparent that any kind of federal, state, or local government stand in opposition to development of nuclear power in their community would almost automatically lead sizable majorities of the public to oppose such construction. This would mean in turn that governmental sanction is a critical element in clearing the way for any local power development.

> As far as private sector opposition goes, environmentalists can muster a good deal of clout and support if they can document that local nuclear power development will mean an increase in the pollution potential of their local area. A majority would respond to such a claim.
>
> However, opposition by Ralph Nader, which has been the case nationwide in recent years, meets with highly mixed reactions. Nader's credibility on the nuclear issue appears to be rising some, but it is still a fact that his opposition would bring only a 38-33% opposed response nationwide. By any measure, Nader does not have the authority potential to trigger opposition to local nuclear power construction anywhere equal to that from government at any level or from the environmentalists when they stick to pollution consequences.

In addition, four possible developments which might enhance public support of local nuclear power construction were explored:

--A substantial 71-19% majority said they would favor local nuclear plan building "if it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live," down marginally from a 74-14% majority who felt the same in 1975. It is apparent that location of nuclear plants in relatively unpopulated places, but still with the ability to serve the power needs of large urban centers, is a "must" for any public acceptance of widespread community nuclear development.

--By 67-18%, a majority would back local nuclear power construction "if a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated," down a bit from the 73-13% majority who felt the same way in 1975. Here, of course, the pivotal role of the word from scientists in the entire nuclear area becomes evident. Indeed, one of the main reasons

why the referendum in California opted pro-nuclear was the manifestation of support from scientists in favor of nuclear power.

--By 66-21%, a majority would also opt for local nuclear power "if it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years," down some from the 72-15% majority who felt the same way in 1975. This, of course, is further evidence of the appeal of nuclear power as a potentially cheaper form of energy to depend upon.

--By 65-21%, a majority would favor local development of nuclear power "if it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs," down a bit from the 69-16% majority who felt identically in 1975. Here, the potential appeal of more jobs attracted by stable and ongoing electric power sources shows some drawing attraction.

Observation:

When the arguments are weighed pro and con, and the final judgment rendered by the public about local community dependence on nuclear power for electric power is recalled -- 51-35% in favor -- it is evident that the sanction of government authority, buttressed by location of the plant itself in a less populous site, becomes the formulation which will pave the way for acceptance of local nuclear power development. Environmentalists could go far to block such development if a case could be made by them that nuclear power would create pollution hazards. By the same token, assurances by scientists that the nuclear plants were operationally sound would firm up backing for community nuclear power rather solidly.

On one final test -- that of elasticity of demand for local nuclear power if electric power rates were more or less than current power rates -- shows an interesting pattern. If nuclear power were to be 10 to 20% more expensive than current sources, sizable majorities of 2 1/2 and 4 to 1 would oppose bringing in nuclear power. By the same token, if rates simply stayed the same, then a 47-43% plurality would favor having nuclear power locally. At a 10% saving in electric power rates, backing for nuclear power at the community level rises to a solid 2-1 acceptance, at 15% better rates, support goes to 65-25%; while at 50% better, it soars to 78-12%.

Table 68

Observation:

It is apparent that the potential appeal of nuclear power as a cheaper source of energy largely clears the way for its acceptance. However, this cheaper source of power argument is obviously a pivotal one. For, in the absence of no rate advantages, nuclear acceptance is only a narrow 47-43% locally, down from a more impressive 55-34% majority who felt that way a year ago.

Final Observation:

It is evident that there have been some marginal losses in backing for nuclear power. However, the magnitude of these declines has not placed overall public backing -- indeed, an underlying public mandate for nuclear power as a major source of electric power -- in any kind of jeopardy. To the contrary, public opinion clearly feels that nuclear power is the coming source of energy, for it is believed to be relatively safe, potentially in abundant supply, can be generated from largely domestic sources, and potentially can give the public a better value in the electric power supply area.

Q.7a

Table 49
FAVOR/OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total Public	61	22	17
East	54	29	17
Midwest	62	19	19
South	65	14	21
West	65	25	10
Cities	55	29	16
Suburbs	61	22	17
Towns	62	18	20
Rural	67	16	17
18-29 years	57	27	16
30-49 years	60	24	16
50 years and over	63	17	20
Some H.S. or less	57	18	25
H.S. grad/some college	64	21	15
College grad	57	31	12
Under $5,000	53	22	25
$5,000-$9,999	57	25	18
$10,000-$14,999	63	24	13
$15,000 and over	68	19	13
White	62	22	16
Black	56	19	25
Men	70	19	11
Women	52	25	23
Total Nucplant Neighbors	70	21	9
Indian Point, N.Y.	57	30	13
Morris, Ill.	70	22	8
San Onofre, Calif.	81	13	6

Q.7a

Table 50

FAVOR/OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Favor	61	63	70	63	75	69	93	92	70	75	32	19
Oppose	22	19	21	23	21	29	7	6	28	19	63	77
Not sure	17	18	9	14	4	2	-	2	2	6	5	4

Q.7a
(L-Q.16b)

Table 51

FAVOR/OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNTED STATES

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Favor	61	90	75	70	59
Oppose	22	6	21	26	23
Not sure	17	4	4	4	18

Q.7a

Table 52
FAVOR/OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

	1976			1975		
	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total Public	61	22	17	63	19	18
East	54	29	17	58	23	19
Midwest	62	19	19	65	18	17
South	65	14	21	64	15	21
West	65	25	10	68	18	14
Cities	55	29	16	64	21	15
Suburbs	61	22	17	65	18	17
Towns	62	18	20	63	19	18
Rural	67	16	17	62	16	22
18-29 years	57	27	16	64	22	14
30-49 years	60	24	16	64	20	16
50 and over	63	17	20	63	15	22
Some high school/or less	57	18	25	57	15	28
High school graduate/some college	64	21	15	66	20	14
College graduate	57	31	12	68	23	9
Under $5,000	53	22	25	52	20	28
$5,000-$9,999	57	25	18	61	17	22
$10,000-$14,999	63	24	13	64	20	16
$15,000 and over	68	19	13	71	19	10
White	62	22	16	65	19	16
Black	56	19	25	55	17	28
Men	70	19	11	73	16	11
Women	52	25	23	54	21	25
Total Nucplant Neighbors	70	21	9	63	23	14
Indian Point, N.Y.	57	30	13	56	28	16
Morris, Ill.	70	22	8	58	25	17
San Onofre, Calif.	81	13	6	75	17	8

Q.7b

Table 53

REASONS WHY FAVOR THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Reasons Why Favor (Those who favor)	Total Public % (61)	Total Nucplant Neighbors % (70)	Political Leaders % (75)	Business Leaders % (93)	Regulators % (70)	Environmentalists % (32)
Help solve energy crisis; alternative to other sources; we're running out of oil, gas, coal	18	21	47	28	28	11
Cheap, less expensive	13	17	17	22	11	13
Better source of energy; the source of energy of the future	9	8	4	17	11	7
Clean energy; less pollution than oil, coal, gas	8	15	19	16	11	13
Make U.S. self-sufficient, independent of foreign energy sources	7	9	13	14	6	4
Unlimited, abundant supply; lasts indefinitely	6	6	17	22	23	11
Produces more power; more efficient, dependable, higher output	6	14	9	14	15	7
Favor it if there are proper controls; as long as it's safe, handled carefully	6	6	8	7	15	2
Inevitable, no alternative	4	4	15	16	11	5
Think, have heard it's safe; don't believe it's dangerous	4	9	21	22	13	5
Less expensive in long run; after large initial outlay, it will cost less	2	2	-	3	2	-
Creates (provides) jobs	2	2	-	2	-	-
Better than strip mining	*	-	-	-	2	-
Nuclear energy necessary until development of solar, new kinds of energy	1	1	15	16	11	5
Development of breeder reactors	-	-	2	5	4	-
Extends availability of fossil fuels, for transport, other uses	-	-	2	2	4	-
Our civilization, way of life depends on ample electric power	-	-	-	2	-	2
All other answers	5	6	4	10	2	4

Q.7b

Table 54

REASONS WHY OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Reasons Why Oppose (Those who oppose)	Total Public % (22)	Total Nucplant Neighbors % (21)	Political Leaders % (21)	Business Leaders % (7)	Regulators % (28)	Environmentalists % (63)
It's dangerous, unsafe; hazard to health; I'm afraid of it	14	19	15	3	17	43
Danger of accident, malfunction; no system is foolproof; don't take proper precautions	4	6	6	3	2	20
Should find other sources of energy	3	2	2	-	-	7
Scientists don't know enough about it	3	1	6	2	13	13
Problems with radioactive wastes; no way to dispose of wastes	3	3	17	2	13	29
Radiation leakage, contamination dangers	3	5	2	2	2	9
Causes air pollution; damages environment	1	3	2	-	-	18
Too expensive	1	3	8	2	4	23
Causes thermal pollution, hot water problems; kills marine life	1	3	2	-	2	11
Don't need more power plants; have enough already	1	1	-	-	2	-
Danger of sabotage	1	1	8	-	2	14
Controlled by politicians, special interest groups; not the people	*	-	-	2	2	5
Inefficient for our needs, unreliable	-	-	6	-	2	9
All other answers	3	4	4	-	2	7

*Less than 0.5%

Q.7e

Table 55
PERSONALLY FAVOR/OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total Public	49	31	20
East	45	35	20
Midwest	50	29	21
South	48	27	25
West	56	31	13
Cities	45	35	20
Suburbs	51	28	21
Towns	54	31	15
Rural	51	27	22
18-29 years	45	36	19
30-49 years	50	30	20
50 years and over	52	27	21
Some H.S. or less	47	27	26
H.S. grad/some college	52	29	19
College grad	47	40	13
Under $5,000	41	33	26
$5,000-$9,999	47	32	21
$10,000-$14,999	50	33	17
$15,000 and over	58	27	15
White	50	31	19
Black	41	32	27
Men	58	29	13
Women	41	33	26
Nucplants are safe	69	18	13
Nucplants not safe	14	71	15
Total Nucplant Neighbors	64	23	13
Indian Point, N.Y.	48	34	18
Morris, Ill.	66	20	14
San Onofre, Calif.	80	14	6

Table 56

PERSONALLY FAVOR/OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

	Total Public		Total Nucplant Neighbors		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
vor	49	54	64	61	53	57	83	88	46	68	27	22
pose	31	24	23	22	32	39	12	6	41	32	68	76
t sure	20	22	13	17	15	4	5	6	13	-	5	2

Q.7e

Table 57
PERSONALLY FAVOR/OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

	1976			1975		
	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total Public	49	31	20	54	24	22
East	45	35	20	49	30	21
Midwest	50	29	21	57	25	18
South	48	27	25	53	19	28
West	56	31	13	56	23	21
Cities	45	35	20	53	26	21
Suburbs	51	28	21	60	24	16
Towns	54	31	15	51	26	23
Rural	51	27	22	50	22	28
18-29 years	45	36	19	54	26	20
30-49 years	50	30	20	59	22	19
50 and over	52	27	21	50	24	26
Some high school/or less	47	27	26	46	23	31
High school graduate/some college	52	29	19	59	24	17
College graduate	47	40	13	57	29	14
Under $5,000	41	33	26	35	28	37
$5,000-$9,999	47	32	21	52	24	24
$10,000-$14,999	50	33	17	57	23	20
$15,000 and over	58	27	15	64	23	13
White	50	31	19	56	25	19
Black	41	32	27	39	26	35
Men	58	29	13	66	21	13
Women	41	33	26	43	27	30
Total Nucplant Neighbors	64	23	13	61	22	17
Indian Point, N.Y.	48	34	18	54	30	16
Morris, Ill.	66	20	14	57	25	18
San Onofre, Calif.	80	14	6	72	11	17

Q.8a

Table 58
WHETHER FAVOR OR OPPOSE COMMUNITY BUILDING A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT TO MEET ALL THE ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS FOR HOME AND BUSINESS USE

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
Favor	51	55
Oppose	35	27
Not sure	14	18

Q.7f

Table 59

WHY FAVOR HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

Reasons Why Favor (Those who favor)	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
	(49)	(64)	(53)	(83)	(46)	(27)
Would be a cheaper, more economical source of power; would lower my electric bills	23	32	28	40	15	20
It's a cleaner source of energy; less polluting	12	22	19	44	19	13
It's available, abundant; unlimited source	8	9	8	28	15	9
Would solve energy crisis, shortage	7	6	2	5	9	-
Nuclear energy is new; it's power source of future	5	4	6	5	6	4
Makes us more independent; won't have to rely on foreign energy sources	5	6	9	7	4	4
It's necessary; we'll run out of energy otherwise	3	3	9	2	9	2
It's more reliable, dependable	3	8	11	16	4	4
Helps conserve natural resources (e.g., coal, oil)	3	4	2	12	4	2
Efficient source of power	3	6	2	11	2	2
I favor it as long as it's safe	2	2	-	4	-	2
I have no objections to it	2	2	4	9	-	-
I have heard it is safe, don't believe it is dangerous	2	7	2	4	2	2
Plants would help create more jobs	1	1	-	-	-	4
Can supply power for greater number of people; large areas	*	1	2	-	2	-
Safe, build safe facilities	-	-	8	18	15	7
Source of energy for future growth in the region	-	-	2	4	2	2
All other answers	4	5	2	7	-	2

Q.7f

Table 60
WHY OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

Reasons Why Oppose (Those who oppose)	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
	(31)	(23)	(32)	(12)	(41)	(68)
It's dangerous, hazardous to community	16	10	13	5	21	36
Radiation, possible contamination, leakage, fall-out	5	6	-	4	6	15
I'm afraid of them; don't want them in community	5	3	4	2	-	7
Risks of accidents, explosions	5	7	2	-	6	11
Should use other, alternative available energy source	3	*	6	4	9	7
Don't need power plant here; have enough power	2	1	2	-	4	2
Water, thermal pollution	2	3	4	-	-	13
Cost too much to build plants	2	1	4	-	4	11
Problem of disposing of waste properly	2	1	4	2	15	18
Prefer solar energy	2	1	6	4	2	5
Shouldn't be dependent on one source of energy; need balance	2	1	6	14	13	4
Rather use land for parks, other uses	*	*	-	-	-	-
Not reliable	-	-	2	-	4	16
Prefer solar energy	-	-	6	4	2	5
Inadequate engineering, technical capacity	-	-	4	-	6	7
Would lead to nuclear blackmail, terrorism	-	-	-	-	2	5
Uranium supply will be exhausted	-	-	-	-	2	4
Morally opposed; would lead to fascism; warp out institutions	-	-	-	-	-	2
All other answers	5	3	9	-	6	15

Q.7r

Table 61
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD FAVOR OR OPPOSE
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community: Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live				
Favor	71	94	41	60
Oppose	19	3	48	7
Not sure	10	3	11	33
If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated				
Favor	67	93	34	53
Oppose	18	3	46	5
Not sure	15	4	20	42
If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years				
Favor	66	93	32	52
Oppose	21	4	51	8
Not sure	13	3	17	40
If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs				
Favor	65	93	29	49
Oppose	21	2	54	8
Not sure	14	5	17	43
If Ralph Nader opposed it				
Favor	33	55	11	13
Oppose	38	19	67	34
Not sure	29	26	22	53

(Continued)

Q.7r

Table 61
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD FAVOR OR OPPOSE
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA
(Continued)

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community		
		Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
If your local government opposed it				
Favor	33	56	9	9
Oppose	52	31	82	54
Not sure	15	13	9	37
If your state government opposed it				
Favor	31	54	8	8
Oppose	53	32	83	54
Not sure	16	14	9	38
If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment				
Favor	18	31	4	5
Oppose	68	56	88	62
Not sure	14	13	8	33
If it were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies				
Favor	7	12	2	3
Oppose	82	78	92	70
Not sure	11	10	6	27

Table 62
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD FAVOR OR OPPOSE
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public 1976 %	Total Public 1975 %
If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live		
Favor	71	74
Oppose	19	14
Not sure	10	12
If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated		
Favor	67	73
Oppose	18	13
Not sure	15	14
If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years		
Favor	66	72
Oppose	21	15
Not sure	13	13
If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs		
Favor	65	69
Oppose	21	16
Not sure	14	15
If Ralph Nader opposed it		
Favor	33	39
Oppose	38	28
Not sure	29	33
If your local government opposed it		
Favor	33	37
Oppose	52	41
Not sure	15	22
If your state government opposed it		
Favor	31	35
Oppose	53	42
Not sure	16	23
If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment		
Favor	18	23
Oppose	68	61
Not sure	14	16
If if were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies		
Favor	7	12
Oppose	82	77
Not sure	11	11

Q.7r

Table 63
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD "FAVOR"
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live	71	79	74	91	77	30
If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated	67	75	77	90	72	33
If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years	66	77	75	84	70	32
If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs	65	68	70	88	65	26

Q.7r

Table 64
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD "OPPOSE"
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
It it were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies	82	73	92	74	87	96
If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting affect on the environment	68	54	43	19	35	77
If your state government opposed it	53	47	40	12	38	64
If your local government opposed it	52	45	34	14	26	64
If Ralph Nader opposed it	38	33	26	7	20	61

Q.7r

Table 65
CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD "FAVOR"
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public	
	August 1976 %	April 1975 %
If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live	71	74
If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated	67	73
If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years	66	72
If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs	65	69

Q.8b

Table 66

LIKELIHOOD OF CERTAIN CONSEQUENCES
OF THE BUILDING OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN OWN COMMUNITY

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community: Favor %	Nucplant in Own Community: Oppose %
More new business would come to the community and create more jobs			
More likely	64	78	50
Less likely	10	6	18
No real change (vol.)	15	12	21
Not sure	11	4	11
Electric power would be a better buy for the money			
More likely	60	77	41
Less likely	13	8	23
No real change (vol.)	13	8	20
Not sure	14	7	16
The community would be a better place to find a job			
More likely	55	72	35
Less likely	13	5	27
No real change (vol.)	20	17	24
Not sure	12	6	14
There would be less air pollution			
More likely	52	72	33
Less likely	17	9	31
No real change (vol.)	13	10	18
Not sure	18	9	18
There would be less water pollution			
More likely	42	61	23
Less likely	23	14	42
No real change (vol.)	14	12	16
Not sure	21	13	19
The community would be a better place to live			
More likely	36	59	11
Less likely	22	8	47
No real change (vol.)	26	25	25
Not sure	16	8	17
You would want to stay in the community for a longer time than before			
More likely	31	49	12
Less likely	20	7	45
No real change (vol.)	36	36	30
Not sure	13	8	13

Q.8b

Table 67
LIKELIHOOD OF CERTAIN CONSEQUENCES
OF THE BUILDING OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN OWN COMMUNITY

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
More new business would come to the community and create more jobs						
More likely	64	47	45	64	49	25
Less likely	10	14	34	5	21	47
No real change (vol.)	15	25	19	31	28	22
Not sure	11	14	2	-	2	6
Electric power would be a better buy for the money						
More likely	60	44	63	78	47	34
Less likely	13	14	26	5	28	52
No real change (vol.)	13	28	11	17	23	13
Not sure	14	14	-	-	2	1
The community would be a better place to find a job						
More likely	55	42	45	60	49	23
Less likely	13	12	23	5	15	36
No real change (vol.)	20	35	30	31	34	30
Not sure	12	11	2	4	2	11
There would be less air pollution						
More likely	52	51	71	81	68	64
Less likely	17	13	21	3	15	18
No real change (vol.)	13	18	8	16	17	11
Not sure	18	18	-	-	-	7
There would be less water pollution						
More likely	42	44	47	59	45	32
Less likely	23	18	36	12	23	43
No real change (vol.)	14	20	17	22	30	16
Not sure	21	18	-	7	2	9
The community would be a better place to live						
More likely	36	40	34	59	30	24
Less likely	22	14	34	3	30	55
No real change (vol.)	26	34	28	38	36	16
Not sure	16	12	4	-	4	5
You would want to stay in the community for a longer time than before						
More likely	31	31	17	47	22	11
Less likely	20	14	25	6	30	57
No real change (vol.)	36	45	53	47	43	25
Not sure	13	10	5	-	5	7

Q.7q

Table 68

WHETHER IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE TO HAVE A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN OWN COMMUNITY IF IT MEANT THAT ELECTRIC POWER RATES WOULD BE...

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
20% more than other types of power		
Worthwhile	17	24
Not worthwhile	72	65
Not sure	11	11
10% more than other types of power		
Worthwhile	25	31
Not worthwhile	64	58
Not sure	11	11
About the same as other types of power		
Worthwhile	47	55
Not worthwhile	43	34
Not sure	10	11
10% less than other types of power		
Worthwhile	60	70
Not worthwhile	30	19
Not sure	10	11
15% less than other types of power		
Worthwhile	65	75
Not worthwhile	25	15
Not sure	10	10
25% less than other types of power		
Worthwhile	74	80
Not worthwhile	16	11
Not sure	10	9
50% less than other types of power		
Worthwhile	78	83
Not worthwhile	12	8
Not sure	10	9

Q.7q

Table 69
WHETHER IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE TO HAVE A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN OWN COMMUNITY IF IT MEANT THAT ELECTRIC POWER RATES WOULD BE
("Worthwhile" only)

	20% More Than Other Types of Power	10% More Than Other Types of Power	About The Same as Other Types of Power	10% Less Than Other Types of Power	15% Less Than Other Types of Power	25% Less Than Other Types of Power	50% Less Than Other Types of Power
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total Public	17	25	47	60	65	74	78
East	12	19	35	51	56	67	72
Midwest	18	28	56	67	71	76	80
South	16	22	45	58	63	75	79
West	26	34	59	70	74	79	81
Cities	16	25	44	56	60	71	74
Suburbs	21	29	52	65	69	76	79
Towns	14	20	45	60	64	71	77
Rural	16	23	48	63	67	76	82
18-29 years	18	27	48	60	65	75	79
30-49 years	15	23	45	59	62	70	75
50 years and over	18	24	49	62	67	76	79
Under $5,000	11	15	31	46	50	63	69
$5,000-$9,999	15	23	42	57	63	70	75
$10,000-$14,999	17	25	48	60	66	74	78
$15,000 and over	22	31	60	72	75	81	84
Favor nucplant in own community	28	40	70	84	88	94	96
Oppose nucplant in own community	5	9	23	33	36	49	55

Q. 74

Table 70

WHETHER IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE TO HAVE A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT IN OWN COMMUNITY IF IT MEANT THAT ELECTRIC POWER RATES WOULD BE . . .
("Worthwhile" only)

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
20% more than other types of power	17	29	18	42	47	9
10% more than other types of power	25	37	31	60	55	18
About the same as other types of power	47	63	73	91	66	31
10% less than other types of power	60	74	80	93	72	36
15% less than other types of power	65	77	80	93	72	38
25% less than other types of power	74	80	82	95	79	40
50% less than other types of power	78	81	83	95	79	44

SECTION IV:

CONFIDENCE TRENDS AND PUBLIC POLICY MATTERS AS THEY APPLY TO THE NUCLEAR POWER ISSUE

Trends in Overall Confidence in Key Institutions

The number of people with a "great deal of confidence" in key institutions in America remains at relatively low levels, despite the arrival of the Bicentennial year. The changes since 1975 have not been precipitous, although many are worth noting:

Table 71

--Among the media, television news still remains the most respected institution, with 32% who say they have a "great deal of confi-

Table 73

dence" in television news, albeit down 2 points from 1975. The press has remained a constant 24%, not changed.

--Confidence in leaders in higher education has dropped off from 36% to 31%, although environmentalist groups have risen from 21% to 25%. And Ralph Nader has gone up in public confidence from 25% to 28%.

--In the private sector of business, confidence in those running major companies and electric power companies has remained about the same while confidence in oil companies has increased from 8% to 12%.

--In the governmental area, confidence in the military has gone up from 25% to 31%. Confidence in the White House (14%), in the Atomic Energy Commission (19%), in state commissions which regulate electric power companies (11%) and in Congress to (10%) has stayed about the same.

--Confidence in labor unions has dropped from 16% to 10% since 1975.

Observation:

Basically, confidence levels in government remain low, without much sign of recovery, as has confidence in the private business sector. There are some signs of higher acceptance of types such as Ralph Nader and environmentalists. Television news continues to score relatively well, while educators have slipped. Compared with ratings of 10 years ago, however, confidence levels are far off and show no real signs of coming back in any major way. This means in turn that the American people can be counted on to be skeptical of taking the word of most spokesmen on nearly any issue -- nuclear energy not excluded.

Specific Credibility of Key Spokesmen on Nuclear Energy Development

As in the case of overall confidence trends, there have not been really major shifts in the roster of potential spokesmen on the nuclear power issue:

Table 74

--At the top of the list, dominating all other groups, are still scientists, who evoke "a great deal of confidence" on the nuclear

Table 76

issue from 58% of the public, unchanged from the level of 1975. In the California nuclear referendum, scientist support of nuclear power development, a "no" vote on the proposition, is widely believed to have been pivotal in determining the outcome.

--The scientists are followed on the confidence scale by the successors to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (39%), and the Energy Research and Development Administration (36%). Confidence in both organizations has stayed fixed over the last year.

--The federal agencies are followed by leading environmentalists, who have gained appreciably in credibility from 26% to 34%, a rise of 8 points, although they still hold fourth place on the list as in 1975. Ralph Nader and his consumerist organization weigh in at 22% credibility, 7th on the list.

--The President of the United States receives 24% high credibility on nuclear matters, unchanged from 1975, but still higher than other governmental sources, except those federal agencies dealing directly with nuclear energy. State governors rank low, albeit they have moved from 9% to 11% high credibility. Congressmen stand at 8% and U.S. Senators at 7%. Candidates for President end up at the bottom at 5%, indicating skepticism of words spoken around campaign time.

--Foundation reports have risen from 17% to 21% in high credibility since 1975, whole news commentators on television have stayed at a steady 22%.

--Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power receive 8% high credibility, while ads in newspapers opposed to nuclear power weigh in at 7%. Obviously, there is a virtual standoff in paid advertising credibility, no matter the source, and this situation has not changed over the past year.

--Labor union leaders command low credibility in the specific area of speaking out on the nuclear question (5% in 1976, slightly lower than 7% in 1975).

-- Heads of electric power companies rank 9th on the list at 19% high credibility (close to their 18% in 1975). Electric utility heads rank just below foundation reports and above news commentators in newspapers. Basically, electric power spokesmen finish about the middle of the list on

credibility, neither high nor low, although all spokesmen receive only minority votes of confidence, with the sole exception of scientists.

Observation:

The public will look to scientists as the authoritative word on the nuclear power question. This was a major finding of the study completed in 1975 and is unchanged today.

Variations in this pattern among the public are found among political leaders, who tend to trust federal nuclear related commissions and agencies and the President more, among business leaders who would pay more heed to these regulatory agency heads and the President as well as heads of power companies, regulators who would listen more to the federal regulatory agencies and the President and foundation reports, and environmentalists whose prestige pecking order shows their own environmentalist groups in top position, with scientists and Ralph Nader and foundation reports high on their respect list.

When given a choice between the news media, here is the line up of trust of the various communications outlets which might expose them to information:

Table 79

--Generally, the public trusts the network TV news shows most, followed by television in general and their daily newspapers, in terms of "reporting facts impartially and not slanted." The leadership groups surveyed, without exception, tend to place their trust more in their daily newspapers and the news magazines.

--Fundamentally, this overall pattern remains virtually unchanged on all of the other dimensions asked about: "the best job in

reporting in full on the energy shortage," "the best job of reporting in full on environmental protection matters," and "trust most in reporting the facts on nuclear power development impartially and not slanted."

Observation:

If scientists hold a special place in credibility in terms of their judgment being trusted on the nuclear power question, then television news with the public and daily newspapers and news magazines with the leadership groups hold special and higher places of trust among the media which might carry such messages. By and large, the public is skeptical of highly partisan messages generated by either proponents or opponents of nuclear power development.

Credibility of Local Electric Power Companies

On the roster of trust in communicating a stand on nuclear power development, the heads of local electric power companies rank about midway in credibility, well below scientists and well above more general political and governmental institutions.

Behind this specific mark of credibility on the nuclear issue rests a widespread public acquaintance and experience with the local electric power company. Here are the key dimensions of public assessment of the job being done by the local power company:

Table 80

--By 82-17%, a sizable majority give their local electric power company high marks on "providing good service," identical to the rating accorded it in 1975.

--By 80-15%, an almost as large majority give their local electric power company high marks on "always having enough electricity to meet expanding local needs," almost the same as the 82-14% majority who felt the same way back in 1975.

--By a narrow 49-48%, a slim plurality give their local electric power company positive marks on "giving good value for the money," little changed from 1975 when a 50-47% plurality came up negative on this key value for the money dimension.

--By 45-34%, a plurality give a positive rating to their local electric power company for "finding new sources of energy to produce more electric power," a slight improvement from the 41-34% plurality who felt the same way in 1975.

--But on "trying to find new sources of energy for electric power which will be less expensive," the public nationwide gives its local electric power company negative marks of 41-38%, even though this is something of an improvement over the 42-33% plurality which was negative over a year earlier in the last survey.

Observation:

By and large, local electric power companies have slightly improved their standing with the American people, standing in good stead on service, having ample power supply to meet local needs, and in finding new sources of energy to produce more electric power. However, the overhang of concern clearly still centers on the cost element, a reflection of rising energy cost worries. The public splits down the middle on receiving good value for the money from its local electric utility and on the efforts of that local company to turn up new sources of

energy which will generate less expensive electric power. By implication, at least, efforts by local electric power companies to come up with new sources of energy, such as nuclear or solar energy, which might hold out the promise of being less impacted by sharp rises in prices, will have obvious appeal to the American people.

The Very Serious Problem of Air and Water Pollution

Tables 84, 85

A substantial 60-38% majority of the American people hold the view that the problem of water pollution in the United States is a "very serious" one, unchanged from the finding in the 1975 survey. In the case of air pollution, a 59-39% majority, up only 2 points since 1975, feel the same about it being a "very serious" problem. Despite pressures to put environmental control efforts on a back burner in order to bring down unemployment or to conserve energy, worry on the part of the American people over the pollution issue remains unabating, deep, and worrisome. There are simply no signs that people are easing in their concern over environment.

Table 86

Yet there is evidence that the leadership groups surveyed simply do not realize the depths of public concern in this pollution area. Compared with the 60% of the public who classify water pollution as "very serious", no more than 32% of the political leaders, 36% of the business leaders, 36% of the regulators, and 41% of the environmentalists think the American people view water pollution as "very serious."

In the case of air pollution, although 59% of the public think this is a "very serious" problem, only 47% of political leaders surveyed,

40% of business leaders, 35% of the regulators and an even 50% of the environmentalists think the people are worried about air pollution being a "very serious" problem.

Observation:

It is apparent that every segment of the leadership community surveyed tends to underestimate by a rather wide margin the extent to which the American public is disturbed and worried about pollution control. There is no doubt in comparing the estimates of the leadership with the actual concerns of the public that such gaps in perception and understanding are among the major contributors to the expressed view of the public that most leadership of the country is "out of touch" with the public by a margin of 67-20%, as recorded in other Harris Surveys. One of the ironies is that a majority of all the leadership groups feel themselves that the environmental question is a "very serious" problem facing this country, implying that the leaders would like to do something about it, but that public opinion keeps them from acting more decisively. In fact, of course, it is the perception gap that not only keeps the leadership from not acting, but also from properly reflecting the concern of their constituents, thus feeding the general mood of disenchantment which still prevails about leadership.

When the public comes to rate the job being done in the pollution area by key elements in the private and public sector, almost every institution receives a negative set of marks, as was the case in 1975. For example, local government's efforts to curb air and water pollution come up with a 54-39% negative rating, just about the same as the 54-40%

Table 87

negative standing of 1975; the federal government is rated 53-39% negative, identical to what it was back over a year ago; state government is rated 53-37% negative, hardly changed from the 54-36% negative rating of 1975; Congress is given 62-27% negative marks, almost the same as the 61-28% negative standing of 1975.

Nor does the private sector fare any better. Electric utility companies are given 53-36% negative marks, compared with 54-36% in 1975; small industrial plants come with a lowly 60-27% negative rating, only slightly improved from the 63-25% negative marks recorded in 1975; and large industrial plants stand at 61-29% negative, a bit better than the 66-25% negative of 1975.

The one institution to come up with positive marks from the public on the pollution issue is environmental protection groups, which receive 58-33% positive marks, up 6 points from the 52-38% recorded in 1975. All leadership groups significantly give the environmentalists high marks: political leaders by 68-30%, regulators by 68-32%, environmentalists themselves by 67-33%, and even businessmen are 50-50% on their rating of environmental protection groups, up from a 53-43% negative rating in 1975.

Significantly, the public is not self-serving in according these ratings on pollution control. When asked to rate the "average citizen" on efforts to curb air and water pollution, the public comes up with no better than a 69-24% negative rating, hardly changed from the 68-27% marks given in 1975.

Observation:

It is patently apparent that the public believes an inadequate job is being done by the establishment in this country to properly control air and water pollution, which are viewed as "very serious" problems by sizable majorities. The public does not spare any of its public or private institutions, nor itself. Only environmentalists have a positive reputation with the public and with the leadership. Obviously, their credibility on environmental questions remains high.

A Matter of Private or Public Ownership

Tables 88, 89

Although public confidence in business is far from high these days, there is very little public demand for a federal takeover of any segment of industry. By a thumping 87-7%, a big majority oppose a federal take-over "of most big business," up slightly from an 83-10% majority who felt the same way in 1975. By 79-11%, almost as large a majority oppose the federal government creating a big business company to compete with private industry, not much different from the 78-13% who felt the same over a year ago; by 78-13%, a sizable majority oppose the federal government taking over all electric utilities, up from 74-17%; by 59-28%, a majority also oppose the federal government "taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble," up from a 52-36% majority who felt that way in 1975; a 69-19% majority oppose setting up a federally owned oil corporation, also up from 63-24% who felt that way in 1975; finally, by 64-21%, a majority oppose creating a federally owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants, slightly up from a 61-25% majority who felt that way in 1975.

Observation:

It is perfectly apparent that there is no mood nor patience in the country for a federal takeover of nearly any sector of the private economy in this country. Perhaps the acid test is the evidence that, by a lopsided 86-11%, a vast majority of environmentalists would oppose the federal government taking over nuclear power plant development.

Q.3c

Table 71
CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE RUNNING INSTITUTIONS

	Total Public			
	Great Deal of Confidence	Only Some Confidence	Hardly Any Confidence	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%
Television news	32	52	13	3
Higher education	31	47	17	5
The military	31	40	22	7
Ralph Nader	28	36	18	18
Environmentalist groups	25	45	16	14
The press	24	53	20	3
Electric power companies	24	53	20	3
Major companies	19	52	23	6
Atomic Energy Commission	19	47	14	20
The White House	14	47	33	6
Oil companies	12	41	41	6
State commissions which regulate electric power companies	11	44	29	16
Congress	10	49	36	5
Labor unions	10	39	42	9

Q.3c

Table 72
CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE RUNNING INSTITUTIONS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Ralph Nader						
Great deal of confidence	28	31	15	7	11	41
Only some	36	32	53	41	49	37
Hardly any	18	21	32	52	38	22
Not sure	18	16	-	-	2	-
Environmentalist Groups						
Great deal of confidence	25	31	23	10	11	49
Only some	45	42	56	54	70	38
Hardly any	16	21	21	36	19	11
Not sure	14	6	-	-	-	2
Electric Power Companies						
Great deal of confidence	24	26	40	50	32	9
Only some	53	50	55	38	57	56
Hardly any	20	21	4	9	9	33
Not sure	3	3	1	3	2	2
Atomic Energy Commission						
Great deal of confidence	19	27	25	31	26	17
Only some	47	45	58	55	49	35
Hardly any	14	12	13	9	23	48
Not sure	20	16	4	5	2	-
Oil Companies						
Great deal of confidence	12	14	30	59	36	15
Only some	41	43	57	31	49	48
Hardly any	41	38	13	10	15	37
Not sure	6	5	-	-	-	-
State Commissions Which Regulate Electric Power Companies						
Great deal of confidence	11	13	9	2	9	4
Only some	44	44	70	53	59	50
Hardly any	29	30	17	43	28	43
Not sure	16	13	4	2	4	3

Q.3c

Table 73
CONFIDENCE TRENDS IN KEY INSTITUTIONS

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
Great Deal of Confidence in People Running:		
Television news	32	34
Higher education	31	36
The military	31	25
Ralph Nader	28	25
Environmentalist groups	25	21
The press	24	24
Electric power companies	24	23
Major companies	19	18
Atomic Energy Commission	19	20
The White House	14	13
Oil companies	12	8
State commissions which regulate electric power companies	11	12
Labor unions	10	16
Congress	10	11

Q.10

Table 74
"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	Total Public	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Scientists	58	72	67	62	38
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	39	58	62	55	21
Energy Research and Development Administration	36	58	53	43	21
Leading environmentalists	34	23	17	17	50
The President of the United States	24	45	53	40	7
News commentators on television	22	8	2	4	9
Ralph Nader and his consumerist organization	22	9	2	6	36
Foundation reports	21	23	33	34	28
Heads of electric power companies	19	23	41	13	7
News commentators in newspapers	18	8	5	4	13
Companies which produce equipment for nuclear power plants	12	9	17	6	9
State governors	11	6	3	6	2
U.S. Congressmen	8	6	2	4	4
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	8	2	5	6	5
U.S. Senators	7	12	2	4	2
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	7	-	-	-	11
Candidates for President of the United States	5	6	2	-	2
Labor union leaders	5	8	2	4	2

Q.10

Table 75

"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	Total Public	Favor More Nucplants in U.S.	Oppose More Nucplants in U.S.
	%	%	%
Scientists	58	67	43
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	39	50	19
Energy Research and Development Administration	36	44	21
Leading environmentalists	34	33	41
The President of the United States	24	29	11
News commentators on television	22	24	18
Ralph Nader and his consumerist organization	22	20	32
Foundation reports	21	25	16
Heads of electric power companies	19	24	8
News commentators in newspapers	18	20	15
Companies which produce equipment for nuclear power plants	12	17	4
State governors	11	13	5
U.S. Congressmen	8	9	5
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	8	11	3
U.S. Senators	7	9	4
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	7	7	7
Candidates for President of the United States	5	6	3
Labor union leaders	5	6	3

Q.10

Table 76

"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	Total Public	
	August 1976	April 1975
	%	%
Scientists	58	58
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	39	38
Energy Research and Development Administration	36	35
Leading environmentalists	34	26
The President of the United States	24	24
News commentators on television	22	22
Ralph Nader and his consumerist organization	22	X
Foundation reports	21	17
Heads of electric power companies	19	18
News commentators in newspapers	18	18
Companies which produce equipment for nuclear power plants	12	X
State governors	11	9
U.S. Congressmen	8	7
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	8	7
U.S. Senators	7	8
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	7	6
Candidates for President of the United States	5	X
Labor union leaders	5	7

X = not asked in 1975.

Q.11a

Table 77
WHETHER HEARD ABOUT THE CALIFORNIA REFERENDUM
TO CHANGE THE STATE'S REGULATION OF NUCLEAR PLANTS

	Heard %	Not Heard %	Not Sure %
Total Public	31	62	7
East	22	69	9
Midwest	29	66	5
South	19	74	7
West	65	30	5
Some H.S. or less	16	77	7
H.S. grad/some college	29	65	6
College grad	56	37	7
Favor more nuclear plants in the U.S.	32	62	6
Oppose more nuclear plants in the U.S.	40	53	7
Total Nucplant Neighbors	48	49	3
Indian Point, N.Y.	23	74	3
Morris, Ill.	39	54	7
San Onofre, Calif.	80	20	-
Political Leaders	98	2	-
Business Leaders	82	16	2
Regulators	87	13	-
Environmentalists	91	9	-

Q.11b

Table 78
HOW WOULD HAVE VOTED IN THE CALIFORNIA REFERENDUM

	Would Have Voted For %	Would Have Voted Against %	Not Sure %
Total Public	31	38	31
East	33	34	33
Midwest	30	37	33
South	28	35	37
West	34	53	13
Cities	38	34	28
Suburbs	29	44	27
Towns	32	34	34
Rural	24	40	36
Favor more nuclear plants in the U.S.	25	50	25
Oppose more nuclear plants in the U.S.	55	25	20
Total Nucplant Neighbors	28	55	17
Indian Point, N.Y.	36	37	27
Morris, Ill.	25	53	22
San Onofre, Calif.	21	75	4
Political Leaders	21	79	-
Business Leaders	9	89	2
Regulators	21	75	4
Environmentalists	54	39	7

Q.9a,b,c,d

Table 79
TRUST IN COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

	Network TV News %	Television in General %	Daily Newspapers %	News Magazines %	Radio %	Magazines in General %	Not Sure %
Trust most to report facts impartially and not slanted							
Total public	33	18	18	14	8	2	7
Political leaders	21	2	48	13	6	4	6
Business leaders	7	10	34	24	10	10	5
Regulators	13	2	31	31	9	7	7
Environmentalists	15	4	35	18	4	9	15
Best job of reporting in full on energy shortage							
Total public	28	18	18	18	4	4	10
Political leaders	4	-	40	39	-	8	9
Business leaders	7	2	31	46	-	12	2
Regulators	6	2	26	49	2	15	-
Environmentalists	2	-	44	26	-	15	13
Best job of reporting in full on environmental protection matters							
Total public	22	17	21	18	4	7	11
Political leaders	6	2	39	33	-	12	8
Business leaders	4	5	39	30	-	18	4
Regulators	4	6	23	42	4	19	2
Environmentalists	2	5	41	16	-	20	16
Trust most in reporting the facts on nuclear power development impartially and not slanted							
Total public	25	14	17	21	4	6	13
Political leaders	8	-	41	31	2	12	6
Business leaders	2	3	26	48	2	14	5
Regulators	9	-	21	45	2	21	2
Environmentalists	7	-	35	20	4	15	19

Q.3a

Table 80
RATINGS OF JOB DONE BY LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

	Total Public	
	August 1976 %	April 1975 %
Providing Good Service		
Positive	82	82
Negative	17	17
Not sure	1	1
Always Having Enough Electricity to Meet Expanding Local Needs		
Positive	80	82
Negative	15	14
Not sure	4	4
Giving Good Value for the Money		
Positive	49	47
Negative	48	50
Not sure	3	3
Finding New Sources of Energy to Produce More Electric Power		
Positive	45	41
Negative	34	34
Not Sure	21	25
Trying to Find New Sources of Energy for Electric Power Which Will Be Less Expensive		
Positive	38	33
Negative	41	42
Not sure	21	25

Q.3a

Table 81

RATINGS OF JOB DONE BY LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neighbors	Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Providing Good Service						
Positive	82	85	92	93	94	68
Negative	17	15	8	7	6	30
Not sure	1	-	-	-	-	2
Always Having Enough Electricity to Meet Expanding Local Needs						
Positive	80	77	91	95	94	73
Negative	15	17	9	5	6	22
Not sure	5	6	-	-	-	5
Giving Good Value for the Money						
Positive	49	46	81	84	70	45
Negative	48	50	17	14	28	54
Not sure	3	4	2	2	2	1
Finding New Sources of Energy to Produce More Electric Power						
Positive	45	51	53	58	47	25
Negative	34	30	43	30	47	66
Not sure	21	19	4	12	6	9
Trying to Find New Sources of Energy for Electric Power Which Will Be Less Expensive						
Positive	38	38	51	56	36	15
Negative	41	42	47	33	57	79
Not sure	21	20	2	11	7	6

Q.13

Table 82
FAVOR OR OPPOSE GIVING PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES THE RIGHT TO SELL TAX-FREE BONDS, WITH THE INTEREST PAID TO BONDHOLDERS TAX-FREE AS WITH MUNICIPAL BONDS, TO FINANCE THE HIGH COSTS IT TAKES TO FINANCE NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total Public	42	31	27
Favor more nucplants in U.S.	55	23	22
Oppose more nucplants in U.S.	16	62	22
Political Leaders	21	68	11
Business Leaders	72	28	-
Regulators	51	43	6
Environmentalists	18	75	7

Q.13

Table 83
FAVOR OR OPPOSE GIVING PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES THE RIGHT TO SELL TAX-FREE BONDS, WITH THE INTEREST PAID TO BONDHOLDERS TAX-FREE AS WITH MUNICIPAL BONDS, TO FINANCE THE HIGH COSTS IT TAKES TO FINANCE NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public		More Nucplants in U.S. Favor		More Nucplants in U.S. Oppose		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Favor	42	48	55	59	16	26	21	35	72	73	51	55	18	17
Oppose	31	25	23	21	62	49	68	61	28	27	43	43	75	75
Not sure	27	27	22	20	22	25	11	4	-	-	6	2	7	8

Q.12a,b

Table 84
SERIOUSNESS OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Water Pollution					
Very serious	60	66	51	64	84
Only somewhat serious	32	34	47	36	16
Not serious at all	6	-	2	-	-
Not sure	2	-	-	-	-
Air Pollution					
Very serious	59	62	50	64	80
Only somewhat serious	32	38	48	36	20
Not serious at all	7	-	2	-	-
Not sure	2	-	-	-	-

Q.12a,b

Table 85
TREND ON HOW SERIOUS IS WATER AND AIR POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
Water Pollution		
Very serious	60	60
Only somewhat serious	32	32
Not serious at all	6	6
Not sure	2	2
Air Pollution		
Very serious	59	57
Only somewhat serious	32	34
Not serious at all	7	6
Not sure	2	3

Q.12a,b
(L-Q.18a,b)

Table 86
SERIOUSNESS OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by: Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Water Pollution					
Very serious	60	32	36	36	41
Only somewhat serious	32	60	59	60	52
Not serious at all	6	6	5	4	5
Not sure	2	2	-	-	2
Air Pollution					
Very serious	59	47	40	35	50
Only somewhat serious	32	47	55	58	48
Not serious at all	7	6	5	7	2
Not sure	2	-	-	-	-

Q.12c

Table 87

RATING OF THE JOB BEING DONE BY VARIOUS GROUPS
IN ATTEMPTING TO CURB AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Environmental protection groups										
Positive	58	52	68	76	50	43	68	59	67	71
Negative	33	38	30	24	50	53	32	39	33	25
Not sure	9	10	2	-	-	4	-	2	-	4
Local government										
Positive	39	40	32	25	43	43	40	38	18	22
Negative	54	54	68	75	57	57	60	60	76	76
Not sure	7	6	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	2
Federal government										
Positive	39	39	58	53	53	51	57	53	35	48
Negative	53	53	42	47	45	43	43	47	65	50
Not sure	8	8	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	2
State government										
Positive	37	36	57	43	38	43	60	55	18	14
Negative	53	54	42	57	62	53	40	45	73	84
Not sure	10	10	1	-	-	4	-	-	9	2
Electric utility companies										
Positive	36	36	45	20	62	63	45	34	24	12
Negative	53	54	53	80	38	37	53	66	76	88
Not sure	11	10	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-

(continued)

Q.12c

Table 87
RATING OF JOB BEING DONE BY VARIOUS GROUPS
IN ATTEMPTING TO CURB AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY (continued)

	Total Public		Political Leaders		Business Leaders		Regulators		Environmentalists	
	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %	1976 %	1975 %
Large industrial plants										
Positive	29	25	26	16	60	63	38	47	22	13
Negative	61	66	74	82	38	35	60	53	71	81
Not sure	10	9	-	2	2	2	2	-	7	6
Small industrial plants										
Positive	27	25	19	16	19	14	32	30	11	6
Negative	60	63	81	80	79	82	64	68	76	75
Not sure	13	12	-	4	2	4	4	2	13	19
Congress										
Positive	27	28	58	47	26	24	45	47	38	60
Negative	62	61	42	53	71	76	53	53	62	40
Not sure	11	11	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	-
The average citizen										
Positive	24	27	15	16	10	14	21	30	20	6
Negative	69	68	85	84	88	88	77	91	75	81
Not sure	7	5	-	-	2	2	2	3	5	-
Oil companies										
Positive	21	21	17	14	53	45	34	26	18	6
Negative	67	68	83	86	45	55	66	74	77	92
Not sure	12	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	5	2
Coal producers										
Positive	20	18	8	4	18	20	15	9	7	-
Negative	60	63	89	92	77	76	85	85	84	98
Not sure	20	19	3	4	5	4	-	6	9	2

Q.14

Table 88
FAVOR OR OPPOSE POSSIBLE ACTIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

	Total Public %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Taking over most big business					
Favor	7	2	2	-	7
Oppose	87	98	98	100	91
Not sure	6	-	-	-	2
Creating a big business company to compete with private industry					
Favor	11	9	3	2	16
Oppose	79	91	97	96	66
Not sure	10	-	-	2	18
Taking over all electric utilities					
Favor	13	4	2	4	20
Oppose	78	96	98	89	73
Not sure	9	-	-	7	7
Taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble					
Favor	28	15	5	15	18
Oppose	59	77	90	78	77
Not sure	13	8	5	7	5
Creating a government-owned oil corporation					
Favor	19	17	5	4	32
Oppose	69	81	95	89	61
Not sure	12	2	-	7	7
Creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants					
Favor	21	8	3	4	11
Oppose	64	89	95	94	86
Not sure	15	3	2	2	3

Q.14

Table 89
FAVOR OR OPPOSE POSSIBLE ACTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

	Total Public	
	1976 %	1975 %
Taking over most big business		
Favor	7	10
Oppose	87	83
Not sure	6	7
Creating a big business company to compete with private industry		
Favor	11	13
Oppose	79	78
Not sure	10	9
Taking over all electric utilities		
Favor	13	17
Oppose	78	74
Not sure	9	9
Taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble		
Favor	28	36
Oppose	59	52
Not sure	13	12
Creating a government-owned oil corporation		
Favor	19	24
Oppose	69	63
Not sure	12	13
Creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants		
Favor	21	25
Oppose	64	61
Not sure	15	14